India

FOR THE

No. 59. New Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1899. [Registered as a Newspaper. {Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.
No. 153. Old Series.]

Notes and News 77
The Debate on the Calcutta Bill ... 80
The White Man's Burden 81
Our London Letter 82
Chronicle of the Week... 83
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report 83
Debate on the Calcutta Municipal Bill 84
The Poona Assassinations: More Nonsense about "Conspiracy" ... 90
The Debate on the Calcutta Municipal Bill: Some Opinions of the Press 91
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 92
Advertisements 92

An Index with Title-page to Vol. IX. of India *(January to June,* 1898) *and an Index with Title-page to Vol. X. (July to December,* 1898) *are ready. Copies will be sent gratis and post free to Subscribers on application to the Manager.*

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE debate in the House of Commons on Tuesday last (of which we print a special report this week) should be productive of good results. The amendment which Mr. Herbert Roberts moved declared that the Calcutta Municipal Bill would practically destroy the representative character of the Calcutta Municipality, and prayed that the further consideration of the Bill might be postponed until a duly constituted Commission had reported upon the objections of the Calcutta ratepayers. For an Indian debate, there was, we believe, an unusually good House, especially after dinner, and the information circulated to members of Parliament stimulated some interest. Mr. Robinson Souttar, who seconded the amendment, spoke with the authority of direct personal knowledge, and we commend his speech to the careful attention of all our readers. It is really conclusive. Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Harwood, and Mr. Schwann did excellent service in continuing the debate, and at last Sir Henry Fowler threw in his lot with the Indian Parliamentary Committee. This is a distinct change for the better, and we hope that a new leaf has been turned over not for this occasion only. Lord George Hamilton's reply—if that is the right name—appeared to have been prepared for a somewhat different discussion. Nor had he even a single supporter. The debate was wound up by Sir William Wedderburn, but the amendment was not taken to a division. It must be assumed that those who were responsible for the adoption of this course knew what they were about. Lord George Hamilton did not consent to the postponement of the Bill, nor to the appointment of a Commission. But he "agreed that they ought to try to preserve as far as they possibly could the representative element on the municipality," and he "hoped the House would accept his assurance that he would, to the best of his judgment, impartially consider the many provisions of this Bill when it came finally before him." We deal with the matter more at large on another page. The debate and its results may probably be said to have been as satisfactory as it was under the circumstances reasonable to expect.

We are glad to see that on Tuesday last, in the House of Lords, Lord Stanley of Alderley called attention to outrages upon Indians by Europeans in India. The scales of justice in India cannot but appear strangely weighted in favour of the European. How different the treatment of the European and the Native aggressor; how different the offences when a European and when a Native suffers! Upon any theory of superior intelligence, education and religion, there is less excuse for the one than the other; upon any theory of the White "bearing his burthen" and being in India for the good of the people, he should be held more responsible in his relations to the Natives (so little in a position to defend themselves) as compared to his own countrymen (so well able to guard their rights and position). The *Madras Standard* of January 22 reports a sentence of three years' rigorous imprisonment upon Private Twigg, of the Borderers, for causing the death by kicking of a comrade. Compare this sentence with the numerous ones we unhappily have had to record, where Natives were the victims and Whites the aggressors. Take the following typical examples:—

Reported in "India."	Offence.	Punishment.
May 20.	A European, for kicking to death a Native.	Fine, Rs. 200.
August 12.	A European, for firing at a Native Wedding (six wounded, one killed)	Fine, Rs. 800.
October 28.	Mr. Ambler, kicking a coolie youth, who died an hour or two afterwards.	Fine, Rs. 10.
November 25.	Private Knight of the Hussars, causing death by shooting of a Native lad.	9 months' imprisonment.

And so goes on merrily the game of offending Indian feeling.

The public has grown accustomed to hearing of assaults by British soldiers on Indians, and there has always been a disposition to make all possible allowances for ignorant men who find themselves in an environment which is to them strange and morally enervating. But a story which comes to us through the *Tribune* is more serious in that some European officers are said to be involved. Mr. Ashgar Ali, an Indian member of the Civil Service, having occasion to travel by train, found himself in a carriage with some Europeans, who are believed to hold her Majesty's commission. Possibly from resentment at Mr. Ali's presence, they became disagreeable, and eventually shut their dogs into his compartment, while they travelled in the next. On Mr. Ali leaving the carriage to complain, they seriously assaulted him, injuring one eye. Mr. Ali appealed to a fellow civilian, Mr. King, who was in the train, but he declined to interfere. The station-master, too, said that he could do nothing, as the accused refused their names, and though this would have justified him in arresting an Indian, he evidently considered such a proceeding impossible in the case of a European. It is, however, believed that Mr. Ali will have no difficulty in discovering his assailants, should he be willing to carry the matter further.

Our readers will remember the case of Ambler, who was fined Rs. 10 for assaulting an Indian. As Ambler admitted the assault, and the Indian died immediately afterwards, it seemed to many that there must have been a miscarriage of justice, in addition to which the procedure adopted in the case was believed to have been informal, as having been committed for manslaughter the accused should have been sent to the High Court. Moreover, after the assault he seems to have made no efforts to succour the dying man. However this may be, the Bengal Government moved the High Court for an enhancement of the sentence. Accordingly on November 18 a rule was issued calling on the defendant to show cause why a new trial should not be ordered or the sentence enhanced. But on January 17, the Court was informed that the notice had not been served. Ambler had absconded.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* draws attention to a curious proceeding on the part of Colonel Gray, a deputy commissioner in Assam. It has always been the custom for judges when passing sentence to expatiate on the enormity of the prisoner's crimes, though usually, it is to be feared, without producing any great contrition in the prisoner himself. But Colonel Gray has improved on this. Having sentenced two criminals to long terms of imprisonment, he some time after had them again brought before him, manacled and in convict dress, to lecture them on their heinous offences. Our contemporary doubts whether it is wise, considering the almost dictatorial powers which district magistrates enjoy, to recruit them from the military service.

The question of the currency was discussed at the recent

meeting of the Indian National Congress with a fulness and lucidity adequate to its importance. We hope the speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha and Mr. G. Subramania Aiyar, who moved and seconded the resolution on the subject, will be placed before Sir Henry Fowler and his Committee. Besides an expression of regret that Indian opinion had not been more fully invited through competent and qualified Indian representatives, the substantial parts of the Resolution were as follows :—

(*a*) That, having regard to the fact that the principal cause of the loss by exchange is the steady growth in the demands on India for expenditure in England, this Congress is of opinion that any artificial device for meeting that loss, either by changing the currency at a heavy cost, or by contracting the internal currency, must add to the pressure on India's monetary resources and to her trading disadvantage.

(*b*) That the only real relief lies in carrying out practically the principle, affirmed by competent authorities, of England bearing an equitable share of that expenditure.

Mr. Wacha pointed out the importance of the question as affecting every individual in the community, and he traced the history of the currency legislation since the passing of the Amended Coinage Act of 1893, with drastic commentary. Especially he remarked on the absence of any legislator who could put forward properly the popular views. "Had there been such representatives," he said truly, "they might have informed the Legislature of the immense mischief that enactment was certain to create, and the dislocation of trade it would bring in its train."

"There is nothing the matter with the currency," Mr. Wacha affirmed; "what is wrong is *the policy* of the Government. It is folly to put the blame on the exchange. Reduce the amounts affected by the exchange, and the whole difficulty will vanish, and prosperity will re-appear. Look into the Home Charges. These have grown significantly since Lord Lytton's time. The average of the five years ended 1876 was 12½ millions; now it is about 17 millions. The main element of this portentous increase is due to military expenditure. "It is the appalling growth of the military expenditure since 1885, when, owing to the revival of the external policy of aggression under Lord Dufferin, there was an addition to the strength of the existing army of 10,000 European and 20,000 Native troops, which has mainly to answer for the embarrassed finances; and next the repeated border expeditions, which have entailed something like 12 crores within 12 years." Nearly one-third of the Home Charges goes for interest on guaranteed and State railways. A great opportunity was lost when Sir John Strachey's recommendation that the railway liabilities should be commuted into silver was pigeon-holed and forgotten. But there will presently be another excellent chance when the time comes for the purchase of the two remaining guaranteed railways. This curtailment of gold expenditure, Mr. Wacha effectively pointed out, was strongly recommended by the Herschell Committee as a first step before taking any action whatever for the closure of the mints. The increase of exports, Mr. Wacha argued, cannot but bleed India, and cannot be beneficial, till the unnatural economic condition ceases. "As Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji truly observed at a recent meeting in Lancashire, the more India grows rich, the more will it be in a position to extend its trade in Lancashire goods."

Mr. G. Subramania Aiyar, in seconding the Resolution, aptly showed the indirect burden that is imposed by an artificially raised rupee—a burden just as heavy as direct taxation, if not so dangerous politically, at any rate till it be discovered by the people. He controverted the opinion of Sir Anthony MacDonnell that the people could bear this indirect burden; "we, assembled in this Congress," he said, "know the truth about the economic condition of the people."

In this important question, as Anglo-Indian merchants have looked solely to the interests of their trade, so has the Government looked to nothing but exchange—an exchange of 16d. per rupee. Between these two dominant interests, the interests of the people of the country has been most flagrantly neglected. It does not require a very intimate knowledge of the people to realise the utter unsuitability of a gold currency to them amidst their circumstances of crushing poverty.

Mr. Subramania also dealt pointedly with the anxiety to attract English capital to India :—

Supposing English capital is attracted and flows into India in millions, is it, after all, such an unmixed blessing? The foreign exploitation of the country, which is already a source of ruinous drains, will only go on on a wider scale, and Lord Salisbury's process of bleeding to death will only be more complete. English enterprise in this country benefits English merchants, and beyond affording employment to a few hundreds more of Indian coolies, confers no substantial and enduring good on the people. I do not in the least undervalue an increase in the funds available as wages to our labouring population; but is it not better that these funds should come from the savings of the people themselves, effected by the expansion of indigenous industry, than that they should be brought by foreign capitalists?

"These considerations, which are so patent and so full of significance to us," added Mr. Subramania, "have been entirely ignored by those in whose hands lies the solution of the currency problem."

It appears that up to last Friday an eminent banker was quite unaware that there is such a question as "Shall we guarantee the India debt?" He had "never heard of the proposal being made." This nescience is only too typical. Of course the proposal has been current for thirty years. It was raised at the time of the transfer from the East India Company to the Crown, when Bright and others urged the equity of the guarantee. The Lord Stanley of the period—the first Secretary of State for India—offered no strong objection to an actual guarantee, and admitted that we did virtually guarantee the Indian debt. The case for an actual guarantee may be briefly stated thus :—

1. The saving to India would be large and direct. As Mr. B. L. Cohen puts it: "Had the British guarantee been given in times past to all money raised by the Indian Government . . . . the saving to India would have been prodigious, while the cost to the British Exchequer would have been absolutely *nil*."

2. The concession would be a matter of form so far as the United Kingdom is concerned.

3. It would be gratefully welcomed by the Indian people who, through their representative men, have asked for this practical manifestation of "Imperialism."

4. It would be a long step towards securing that real and intelligent control over Indian expenditure which Indians themselves and the more thoughtful of our public men here have hitherto striven for in vain.

The objections are, of course, embedded in certain political traditions, and in a certain departmental stronghold. That citadel has yet to be carried. But the question, "Shall we guarantee the India debt?" has long been settled in argument and equity.

As will be seen from our Parliamentary report, an interesting supplementary question arose out of Lord G. Hamilton's reply yesterday week to Sir William Wedderburn's question regarding the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers. Lord G. Hamilton, in his considered reply to the original question, used the phrase "the forces employed *on* the North-West frontier *in* India." Whereupon he was promptly reminded that the question referred to troops employed not *on* but beyond the frontier. To this important reminder he replied that Sir William Wedderburn was "playing with words, because we [who are "we"?] deny that there are any troops beyond the Indian frontier." This is a very serious matter. It is in the highest degree unseemly that the Secretary of State should thus flatly deny notorious facts. Do not frequent telegrams speak of Indian troops moving in Swat and Bajaur, at Lundi Kotal, in the Kuram valley, on the Samana range, and in Waziristan—all of them territories which, by the Act of 1858, are "beyond the external frontiers" of her Majesty's Indian possessions? Will Lord G. Hamilton deny that the garrisons on the Malakand and at Chakdara are employed beyond the Indian frontier; or the detachments on the Samana range; or those in the cantonments set up within the last five years, in defiance of the law, in Waziristan? The Indian Government's own maps suffice to show how gravely misleading Lord G. Hamilton's assertion is. No diplomatic "demarcation" line, no executive orders (as in the Kuram and in Waziristan), not even the assertion of "jurisdiction" (as in Baluchistan and Quetta), though passed by the Viceroy's Council, can set aside or supersede the statutory provisions under which "the external frontiers of her Majesty's Indian possessions" have been defined and prescribed. It is idle to talk about "playing with words" when the question is one of downright lawlessness.

It has taken a long agitation to bring the Bombay Government to deal with the case of the Khots, and now that Government has laid its hand to the grievances it has done so with trained perversity. The proposals are

strangely retrograde. They would virtually confiscate at one stroke the rights and property of thousands of people. Why does not the Government meet the challenge that has been addressed to it to publish the evidence on the subject in its possession? Anyone who looks into Mr. E. T. (now Mr. Justice) Candy's "Selections from the Records of Government Regarding the Khoti Tenure," or Captain (afterwards Sir) G. Wingate's "Report on Survey and Assessment for Ratnagherry," or the various pamphlets issued on behalf of the Ratnagiri Khoti Association will be able to see, from both sides of the dispute, how very complicated and obscure some parts of the question are, and how easily therefore injustice may be done by a hasty and ignorant treatment. The peculiarity of the local conditions and the historical composition of the Khoti class alike suggest patient investigation, which can be of little use unless the views of the Khots themselves be fully collected and frankly considered. There are not wanting unfortunate indications that some enthusiastic revenue officers have hastily adopted totally erroneous theories of the origin and nature of the Khoti tenure, and have succeeded in influencing Government in a sense at variance with the reports of far more experienced officials of an older generation. There is a widespread suspicion that the Khots are to be driven to give up their rights—that is, to extinguish themselves. Perhaps in the six months for which the Bill has been wisely referred back to the Committee Government will see its way to some workable and just arrangement.

The Ratnagiri Khots' Association has the credit of having influenced this sensible step of relegation. On January 21 the Association petitioned with this view, praying for the appointment of "a small commission of officials and non-officials to consider, take evidence and report upon the subject within as short a time as possible," or in the alternative for a postponement "at least for a few months in order to give sufficient time to the people to place their objections before Government." Nothing could be more reasonable. As the Association pointed out:—

The subject is so complicated and is so much over-shrouded by false theories, one-sided opinions, *a priori* prejudices, and general ignorance of the working of the Khoti system, that no satisfactory solution is possible till a good deal of light has been thrown on both sides upon the several points involved in the Bill. Some of these again are new, or at least had never come before the public in the shape in which they are now brought forward. Evidence on these points is either wholly wanting or not available to the public.

The Bill itself had not even been translated into Marathi at the date of the petition, so that practically the Khots knew nothing of its contents, and could not make their opinion heard. The main point of the petition, however, is of fundamental importance. The Khoti Act of 1880 was founded on a deliberate compromise agreed to between the Government, the Khots, and the tenants, and embodied in the Government Resolution, No. 2474, dated April 24, 1876. The argument is that "it is not competent for Government to introduce any radical change in the Act, or in the settlement based upon it, without the previous assent of the other parties." And Mr. M. R. Bodas, the General Secretary of the Ratnagiri Khots' Association, maintains that "there is not a single instance where a tenant, when left to himself, has voluntarily complained against the Khoti system, while there are many cases in which he has protested against the very measures ostensibly initiated for his benefit." Such a responsible declaration emphasises the urgent necessity of full and deliberate enquiry.

The main object of the Bill is to put an end to difficulties in connexion with the determination and the recovery of rents payable by the occupancy tenants. What are these difficulties? We want more light on this point. But, for one thing, the Government want to do away with cropshare rents and to substitute fixed rents, on the ground that cropshare rents involve appraisements, and appraisements involve injustice to tenants. The feeling of the tenants, therefore, is all important. But it is to be remembered that the cropshare rent is an old battleground, and an essential part of the existing compromise. Again, the Bill would reduce the rents coming to the Khoti—the traditional half of the produce of rice-lands and one-third of Warkas. This is a question of vested rights, and requires the most delicate handling. The minor matters need not be discussed now. As to proposed remedies, the Hon. D. A. Khare, in his very able speech on the first reading of the Bill in the Bombay Legislative Council, properly pointed out that, "supposing those difficulties to exist"—though the facts still remain to be proved—the Bill "does not provide any way of removing them, except by way of practically abolishing existing rights." The remedy is worse than the disease. It "disturbs wholesale all confidence in solemn Government declarations."

The power of the Government to keep on raising rents has never been more outrageously exerted than in the case of certain cultivators of the Khas Mehal. At one time the Mehal was a waste land let for an almost nominal sum of four annas per biggah. By a great expenditure of money and labour the tenants have brought the district to a state of prosperity, and as a reward the deputy-collector raised their rents. The rayats appealed, but that official, according to the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, did not even inform them of the date fixed for hearing their objections, and delivered judgment in their absence. This was bad enough, but still worse troubles were in store for them. It is said that this judgment being delivered on the day before the vacation, and it being therefore impossible to obtain certified copies of the judgments, the appeals were barred by effluxion of time. However this may be, in January, 1898, Mr. Buckland, Commissioner of the Presidency Division, made a further increase in the rents. As a result, land for which other Khas Mehal tenants pay Rs. 4 per biggah, and for which the rayats of the Zemindars pay only Rs. 2, is rented in the area of increase at Rs. 10 and more; and certificates are now being issued for its recovery.

The *Mahratta* on the whole views the Bombay Administration Report for 1897-98 favourably. But there are a few points to which it takes exception. Comparing the last famine with that of 1876-77, our contemporary says:—

The principal point of contrast between the two famine administrations is that while in the first famine the suspended revenue amounted to 20·45 per cent., that in the latter amounted to 4·52, and while in the first famine the remitted revenue amounted to 2·23 per cent. the same in the second famine amounted to 0·9. This contrast speaks for itself and also we think for the agitated state of public feeling that prevailed in the second famine. Not another word would be necessary to prove that the revenue administration had worked with almost merciless severity, and we do not see how the realisation of the last pie of revenue from the poor rayats in such a famine as the Presidency suffered from two years ago could be made a point of administrative boast by any rulers.

Again, it very naturally protests against the Poona and Satara Press prosecutions, the arrest and imprisonment of the Natus and the trial and execution of Damoda Chapekar being treated as if they were events forming part of one and the same transaction. The conduct of the Government in this matter is a monstrous injustice.

The movement in favour of opening the higher grades of the Indian Army to the Indians is receiving new support every day. The *Civil and Military Gazette* has a strong article on the subject. It says:—

A man of proved honour, courage and probity should have an opportunity of really rising to the position among the sahibs, among the white men who rule the country, that he is already fitted by birth and ancestry to hold. The number limited to such grades need be but few, indeed can be but few; but the present closed door against which the best man in India beats hopelessly is felt by many to be a mistake.

And to the argument that an Indian could not be put in command of British officers, it answers that in the Civil Service and the Indian Medical Service Englishmen take orders from Indians who are their seniors as a matter of course. Coming from such a source this is a valuable pronouncement on the question. The same paper goes on to recommend the foundation of a Military College for training Indian cadets, as advocated long ago by the Duke of Connaught. The *Friend of India* warmly seconds this view, and draws attention to another aspect of the question. The admission of Indian officers through such a college, and not by way of the ranks, would open the service to the members of the old military families, who have found themselves shut out by our dominion from the career associated with their ancestral traditions. It is said that in the Russian Army no man is debarred by race alone from attaining the highest rank. But of course the barbarous despotism of Russia must not be compared with our own enlightened rule, which exists only for the good of the people of India.

THE DEBATE ON THE CALCUTTA BILL.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS, on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, brought under the consideration of Parliament on Tuesday last the obnoxious Bill now before the Bengal Legislative Council for the extinction of real self-government in Calcutta and the substitution of a sham under official direction. Mr. Roberts moved to add at the end of the Address the following words:—

And we humbly assure your Majesty that we regard with grave concern the introduction of the Calcutta Municipality Bill, now under consideration by the Bengal Legislative Council, which, if enacted, will practically destroy the representative character of the Calcutta Municipality, and will constitute a retrograde step in the system of local government in India, and pray that your Majesty will graciously direct that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed until a duly constituted Commission has taken evidence and has reported upon the objections urged against the Bill by the ratepayers of Calcutta.

Mr. Roberts set forth the history of representative municipal administration in Calcutta, effectively contrasting the former, the existing, and the proposed conditions, and claimed that the existing system had been clearly a success. Mr. Robinson Souttar, whose great defence of Indian education will be gratefully remembered, was able in a brilliant and really conclusive speech to bear personal testimony to the fact that "the Commissioners of Calcutta were an exceedingly well-educated, public-spirited and honourable body of men, who would be welcomed even in this honourable House"—indeed "a much higher class than those occupying similar positions in this country." This weighty testimony Lord George Hamilton could traverse only by asserting that "in recent years it was the almost universal opinion that there had been a steady deterioration both in the character of those who served on the municipality and in the work done." The universality of the opinion depends on the area in Lord George's mind; there has been ample evidence in recent months that such is not the opinion of the population of Calcutta, whatever a narrow clique of officials may choose to think or to say. Lord G. Hamilton finds that "a third of the Corporation is composed of barristers," and he left the House to draw the conclusion that they must therefore be men of obviously ill-instructed, ill-trained and stupid intellects. It is but another example of the Secretary's clever way of cutting his fingers when he plays with edged tools.

Mr. Souttar drew pointed attention to the essential element in the problem when he laid his finger on the mischief of over-centralisation. This is just the mischief that the Bill, if it is not amended, will not only perpetuate but disastrously emphasise.

At present (he said) there are 75 Commissioners, and the business of Calcutta is looked after by 18 men. There are two results from this fact; in the first place, the work is scamped, and in the second place it is made abortive by criticism. Thus, there are 18 busy men and 57 critics. In the future, however, there will be 12 busy men and 63 dummies. But this distribution is based on a misconception of the difficulty which exists in Calcutta. What is wanted there is not concentration, but a division of labour: each Commissioner should be appointed to a particular task. It is impossible to govern Calcutta, or any other Indian city, through 12 Commissioners.

There is no getting over Mr. Souttar's argument, and it ought to put an end to the futile prosecution of the Bill and divert the activities of reformers into channels that will lead to the strengthening and not to the destruction of local self-government. Mr. Souttar's final suggestion that the Government, instead of "deviating from the policy of slowly and steadily teaching the Natives to govern themselves," should create a powerful Local Government Board, has very much to recommend it, and all who care about the welfare of India will hope to see it adopted.

After sympathetic and moderate speeches by Mr. McKenna, Mr. Harwood, and Mr. Schwann, Sir Henry Fowler intervened. "I myself," he said, "do not see any evidence to justify the statement that the system has broken down and that we should introduce into an experiment not ten years old the novel principle of substituting nominated officials for popularly elected bodies, and throwing to the winds an efficient popular government." He also touched on "the unwisdom of exciting public feeling on a question of this sort." Lord George Hamilton had evidently come prepared with a rotund defence of his peculiar people "who are discharging the most difficult and onerous duties of any public servants in the world." But, unhappily for him, nobody had had anything to say in depreciation of the Civil Service. And so he began to flounder. "Never," he blurted out, "had a motion been made which struck deeper at the root of self-government in India." No wonder that everybody looked amazed. But assuredly nobody anticipated the explanation. The British Government, he said, has been endeavouring to promote local self-government "by the creation of local legislatures," which "have within certain limits freedom of action." Very naturally Mr. Harwood wanted to know what is the composition of the Legislature of Bengal, and how much is elective. "What is the use of the hon. gentleman putting questions of that kind?" hotly demanded Lord G. Hamilton. True; what use, indeed? No questions could be more pertinent; but what use when it is a man like Lord G. Hamilton who is there to answer? If he had deigned to be so useful as to answer Mr. Harwood's questions the House could hardly have shut its eyes to the intolerable insult that was being put upon it. In the local legislatures the official element is the initiating and controlling power; the representative element can only express an opinion or ask a question. Indeed, it is only by courtesy that the epithet "representative" could be applied at all. The thing is mere trifling with a serious subject; for, as it happens, and as Lord George Hamilton knows, the people of Calcutta have been alarmed by this Bill, so kindly prepared by their "representatives," and, as Sir William Wedderburn told the House, have protested against it in a long series of large and influential meetings. Further, "the hon. gentleman," said the Secretary of State, "proposes, in the interests of local self-government, to summarily arrest the whole of the proposed legislation of Bengal, to stop the investigation now being carried on by a special committee, and to institute a commission whose business is not to take an impartial view of the questions under consideration, but whose duty is to be confined to reporting on the objections which could be urged." This sort of caricature may or may not be smart debating. But it makes a poor show when one is looking for statesmanship.

We do not for a moment ask for any undue leniency in judging the work of the Calcutta Corporation. But we do most insistently demand proof before condemnation. Lord George Hamilton lays down the platitude that "there is a line beyond which leniency is no longer possible," and declares that in the case of Calcutta "that line was reached when the inaction of the municipality endangered the lives of the community under its charge." We say fearlessly that on the same principle there is not a great municipality in the three kingdoms that would not forfeit its privilege of self-government to-day. Why, the sacred Corporation of the City of London itself would, at this rate, be blotted from the things that be, and transformed into a departmental annexe of Government. Where is the good of large talk about the plague? The Calcutta Corporation met the approach of the plague so efficiently that it would task all the officials in that centre of panic-stricken government to produce a single verified case of the fell disease. It is wholly unnecessary for us to reprint the long chain of testimony, official and non-official, in utter contradiction of Lord George Hamilton's extravagant assertions. There is not an atom of doubt that the reconstituted authority will not do a single thing for sanitation that the existing authority is not ready and willing to do. The necessary improvements are obvious. What is not obvious is the source of the money to effect them. Nothing could more glaringly condemn the audacity of basing the Bill upon reasons of sanitation.

Notwithstanding all this, Lord George Hamilton impressively assured the House that "he would, to the best of his judgment, impartially consider the many provisions of this Bill when it came finally before him." We trust he will. It is difficult, in the face of his speech, and particularly of that part of his speech where he told the House that the local legislatures "had to get the assent of the Viceroy and the Secretary of State in Council" before introducing legislation, to give very serious weight to the assurance. True, it may turn out eventually, in the final form of the Bill, that the situation wears a very different aspect from the first draft submitted, or from the general descriptions of the legislative purpose. True, also, that the public reception of the proposals may cast a fresh light on them. But the official attitude of mind, which is fully developed in Lord George Hamilton, encourages but

the most modest hope. The Bill has got within the vicious circle. Its introduction has been approved by the Secretary of State: what probability is there that its passing will not be confirmed by him? It is plain that the facts of the case are not before him in the sense in which they lie open to all the people of Calcutta. There is perhaps more hope in the independence and foresight of Sir John Woodburn. As Lord George Hamilton said, "it is a serious matter"—very serious indeed, in ways that he has apparently not yet appreciated. Anyhow, the debate must have done something to attract public attention in the constituencies at home, and the withdrawal of the amendment without a division shows that Mr. Roberts and his friends have confidence in Lord G. Hamilton's solemn undertakings to preserve the representative character of the municipality and to review the Bill impartially when it comes finally before him.

THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN.

IN the history of our empire it has ever been the custom to cloak the worst deeds under the best professions, and to excuse war, outrage and plunder under the sacred names of patriotism, religion and duty. The English planters in Ireland held down the Papists in defence of Protestantism; and the buccaneers committed piracy on the high seas as a protest against the Inquisition and the tyranny of Spain. But it has been reserved for our own time to show this spirit of hypocrisy in its most offensive form, and to advocate the conquest and exploitation of weaker races in the name of principles which are only half believed at home and are constantly violated abroad. The hatred of the buccaneers for Spain was at least real; whether the Imperialists of our own day are moved by any care for the spread of modern civilisation is more than doubtful.

These thoughts are suggested by the poem, "The White Man's Burden," addressed to the United States by Mr. Rudyard Kipling. It is an exhortation to the people of that country to imitate England in the career of empire, and extend by force the blessings of its civilisation to the less advanced populations of the world. To that end he passes over all the failures, all the meanness, and all the crimes that that empire has produced, while he represents it as the triumphant victory of a devotion that seeks no selfish recompense and looks only to the welfare of the conquered. It is not easy to see what kind of men Mr. Kipling has in view, whether—

> Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
> Half devil and half child,

like the African negroes appear to be in his imagination; or whether, as his reference to plague and famine suggest, he is thinking of the Indians, with whose country he and his fame are so closely associated. The lines quoted above certainly will not fit the heirs of an ancient civilisation which was great and illustrious when our ancestors were numbered with the savages. Yet the supporters of empire can hardly complain if they are judged by our rule in India, the most marked and extended case, and the one that has been especially singled out for praise and self-glorification. Now the claims made by Mr. Kipling may be tried by three tests: (1) Is it the fact that the ruling motive of our conduct abroad is the love of our civilisation and the desire to spread its blessings over backward races? Then (2) have we shown such superior skill and knowledge in our government of the Indians as justifies the white man—to quote the *Spectator's* remarks on the poem—in controlling "probably for a couple of centuries all the dark peoples of the world"? And (3) is that respectful sympathy shown by the English in India for the people of that country which might be expected from those exercising a paternal authority and actuated by an unselfish devotion to the welfare of the Indians? If the answer is in the negative, then surely the whole argument of the poet and the whole spirit of the poem stand condemned.

That our civilisation has many great qualities, that it has witnessed an unparalleled scientific advance and an unheard-of accumulation of wealth and power may be readily granted. No previous ages have made so many discoveries in science as have the past three centuries of Western Europe. No age before our own has been able to vie with ours in the manufacture of calicoes, bogus companies, and explosives. Our fathers were much inferior to us in the saving and taking of life—in improvements in drainage and weapons of war. But these are scarcely triumphs to inspire missionary enthusiasm. Our age is one in which great progress has been fertile in great discontent, an age in which the sufferings of our own people have not yet found a remedy. The *Spectator* especially appeals to science and religion, but these in our age are not always in harmony. Our contemporary kindly says that "no Asiatic untaught by a European believes a reasonable creed." It is to be feared that all Europeans are not agreed as to what is a reasonable creed and that some who have done a valiant part in developing that "faculty of accumulating wisdom" on which the *Spectator* congratulates the white race, would be inclined to condemn the *Spectator's* creed as unreasonable. These remarks on the want of reason in Asiatic religions breathe the very spirit of barbarian intolerance and would be enough of themselves to show how hollow are its boasts of civilisation. But however superfine the civilisation of Europe may be, it is not of a kind to inspire self-sacrificing devotion. The mongrel outcome of warring science and religion, richer in material than in moral victories, and unable to deal successfully with the problems that arise within itself, it may do well enough as an excuse to cloak the real motives of aggression and domination, but it is far too much compact of good and ill to give rise to that unselfish enthusiasm with which Mr. Kipling would have us believe it stirs the physical-force missionaries of our empire.

Again, it is difficult to see in our rule in India any of that extreme wisdom which would be necessary to justify the claims of Mr. Kipling. It is part of the white man's burden to

> Fill full the mouth of Famine
> And bid the sickness cease.

Yet with all our vast material powers famines have been at least as frequent under our rule as ever before—and it should be remembered that famine is not a result of scarcity, but of the poverty that can make no provision against scarcity. Nor have our Indian administrators been especially successful in dealing with plague. So far from having shown themselves therein superior to the people of the country, they have at last and reluctantly come round to the views that the Indians have all along expressed; but they did not make this change till they had inflicted on that unfortunate people untold suffering and misery. Mr. Kipling cannot be congratulated on having chosen examples particularly fitted to enforce his point. But it is to be feared that any other examples would have served him as ill. It is only necessary to look—not at the organs of the Congress and other ungrateful people—but at the Anglo-Indian journals to see how many are the blemishes in that imposing edifice of British rule, so costly, so cumbersome, and often so futile. Nor, as the generations pass, do the difficulties grow less. The educated Indian cannot be classed among "the fluttered folk and wild," yet as education spreads, so does sympathy between the two races diminish, while distrust and contempt increase continually. The goal recedes and the burden becomes more burdensome. It is not to be wondered at that some Anglo-Indians doubt, as the writer in the *Spectator* has heard them, whether the work they are performing is "a great duty or a great dacoity."

And it is this growing contempt that is, after all, the supreme answer to Mr. Kipling's heroics. Men, we are asked to believe, go forth into exile not for an assured and well paid career, not even for the glory of their native land and the honour of serving her, but to benefit the Indians against their will. Is it so? If it be so, there were never men who concealed their real motives so successfully as the great mass of English officials in India. Pride of race and of office, devotion to the duty that has been undertaken, obedience and integrity, the pleasure of fulfilling with credit their allotted task in life, the hope of an honoured and secure retreat, all these motives in varying proportions are to be seen among the English in India. But how few could own as their over-mastering motive a devotion to the interest of the subject people; and of those few, would it not be true to say that almost all are to be found not among the glorifiers of empire and the white man's mission, but among those who seek to minimise the white man's interference and to give more and more power to the Indians in controlling the destinies of their country? Can it be seriously affirmed that an unselfish devotion to

the progress of weaker races fills the hearts—not of those Anglo-Indian swashbucklers who can hardly open their mouths without insulting their Indian fellow-subjects—but even of those earnest advocates of the new crusade who talk of "sullen peoples" and "heathen folly"? Is this the language of the missionaries of a beneficent civilisation? Can anything be in worse taste than to complain of—

> The blame of those ye better,
> The hate of those ye guard;

or more likely to stir seditious thoughts in the myriads of Indians who, despite the contempt that has been lavished on them, and though treated as aliens in their own land, have remained steadfastly loyal to the British connexion? Devotion without sympathy, self-sacrifice for those whom you insult is a glaring contradiction—a degrading and transparent hypocrisy from which at least the great mass of Anglo-Indians are free.

To be led away from the duties around him by the love of domination or the hope of gain, and to find a fitting reward in exile and thankless toil—this is the white man's true burden, the nemesis that waits on empire.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

SINCE I last wrote the hopeful spirit among the Liberals in Parliament has been maintained. Just at present I believe we have in evidence a phenomenon most unusual in politics. As a rule the last place to seek the high water mark of Liberal thought and endeavour and aspiration is at Westminster. As a rule, I repeat, all this must be looked for in the country. But just now I really believe that there is as much "go" among many of the rank and file in the little Liberal parliamentary host as could be found in the soundest constituency in the North of England. The new Liberal leader has so far turned out a success; indeed, so great a success that the Tories are playing the ludicrous game of pretending to sympathise with Sir William Harcourt and Mr. John Morley, on account of the alleged "ingratitude" of the Liberals. Those statesmen are too sound in their Liberalism and too experienced in politics to be deceived by any such thin device. I have no doubt that Sir William Harcourt rejoiced honestly and whole-heartedly that his friend Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman began his first week with a brilliant oratorical success, and finished it by bringing the Government majority down to 33, which means a drop of more than 100.

It may be well, however, to leave the consideration of the general political situation to attempt to describe one part of last Tuesday's proceedings in the House. For an Indian question came on after there had been a run of questions, two divisions on small and even trivial affairs, and a Scottish debate of some little length. Let me here go back for one moment to question time. Mr. Bartley, a rather dull London Tory, put some enquiry as to whether the conscientious objector to the sanitary requirements of the Indian Government was recognised and excused. Of course everyone knew what Mr. Bartley's object was. He does not care a straw about the natives of India, and probably scarcely knows where India is. He wanted to have a sly dig at the recent vaccination legislation of the Government. But what struck me was the scornful outburst which greeted one of his questions, "then does not the Government recognise conscientious objectors in India?" There came from his friends the loud laugh which spoke the vacant mind, and the brutal mind also. It may or may not be necessary to enforce the regulations referred to, but the spirit shown in that vulgar outburst is certainly not the spirit in which we ought to try to govern a sensitive and cultured people, especially when dealing with matters of a delicate nature.

However, let me return to the debate raised on Mr. Herbert Roberts's amendment to the Address. He expressed a hope that the Bill now being considered by the Bengal Government, which will, if passed, destroy the representative character of the Calcutta Municipality, might be postponed until the ratepayers of Calcutta had had a chance of being heard. It was a moderate and a reasonable request, urged in a speech of marked ability and restraint. And I noticed that, as is so often the case in the House, this plea for fair and equitable treatment of the natives of India was made by men who had studied the question closely, and most of whom had spent a good deal of time in India. For instance, Mr. Robinson Souttar, who seconded the amendment, knows the Calcutta Municipality well. Mr. Schwann has travelled in India repeatedly, Mr. Harwood has attended Indian National Congresses, and I need not say that Sir William Wedderburn is fully acquainted with the peoples of that vast dependency. But as a rule they speak to almost empty benches. At one time and for a long time during Tuesday's debate only Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry Fowler, and Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth sat on the front Opposition bench, while the Government was represented by Lord George Hamilton alone. I noticed a small band of Irishmen, John Dillon among them, who apparently taught by injustices to their own people are always ready to listen to the wrongs of our Indian fellow-subjects. Let me do Sir H. Fowler the justice to say that he supported the amendment; and that fact alone speaks volumes for the moderation of its proposals, for it is seldom that any movement of the Indian National Congress or Parliamentary Committee gets a smile from him. Lord George Hamilton's attitude was characteristic. He said that when this Bill (which is aimed at the representative character of the Calcutta Municipality) emerges from the Bengal Government it will come to him for final official approval or disapproval. He would be impartial—oh! so impartial! He therefore did not wish to forestall or prejudice his decision. Having thus promised impartiality he proceeded to make a carefully prepared and severe attack upon the municipality in question. It was all so like Lord George, especially the fact that he was for the most part reading a speech which he may or may not have written, but which he did not quite appear to understand.

Sir W. Wedderburn replied, and gave his lordship some necessary instruction. But he had to ask Lord George to be good enough to listen, and more than once Sir William was interrupted by unmannerly jeers from Tories who are always bored unless there is a personal incident or something sensational to tickle their dull tastes. I was glad to notice that the Liberals resented these interruptions and cheered Sir William not only encouragingly, but even fiercely. It was really laughable to see the ease with which he knocked over the case set up by Lord George. Calcutta was said to be filthy in parts. So is London or any other big city. But Calcutta had at least kept out the plague. (I ought to have said that whenever Lord George seemed gravelled for an argument—and that was often—he took refuge in assuring the House that the plague is really a very serious complaint.) Moreover the representative Council had beaten the officials as administrators, as had been proved by the fact that the suburbs, once under the control of the officials, had had to be taken over by the municipality. The Government seemed to rely upon statements made by the late and the present Governors of Bengal, but Sir William showed with telling effect that both these gentlemen had quite recently sung the praises of the Calcutta Municipality. Yet now they were in favour of altering the representative section of it from a proportion of two to one as compared with the appointed section into a proportion of one to two. "You will not get the best men to serve under such conditions," said Sir William, and he wound up by saying that all they asked for was that an institution which had worked well for twenty years should not be upset until its friends had had a fair hearing. "Some of its members are accused of talking too much," he went on; "well, this House at least should be a little indulgent to such an offence." And I thought so too. In the end the amendment was withdrawn, apparently Lord George Hamilton's promise of impartial consideration being thought all that could be obtained. I ought to add that though comparatively few members followed the debate throughout—occasionally there was a good House, especially as the evening wore on—yet the Strangers' Gallery was quite full all the time, and only one of those outside listeners was obviously from dress and appearance a native gentleman from India.

The s.s. "Arabia" (P. and O.) leaves London on February 16 for Bombay. Her passenger list includes the following names:—Capt. and Mrs. Crommelin; Capt. and Mrs. Betham; Rev. R. Bateman; Capt. J. A. Fischer; Capt. and Mrs. McFarlane; Colonel R. Egerton; Surg.-General Taylor; Miss Nightingale; Colonel W. G. Fraser; Dr. and Mrs. Rudduck; and Mr. A. J. Digby.

CHRONICLE OF THE V

THURSDAY, February 9.—In the House shop of Winchester drew attention to statements lately made respecting the action of the Bishops in dealing with irregularities in public worship.

In the House of Commons Mr. Samuel Smith's amendment to the Address (representing that, in view of the lawlessness in the Church, some legislative steps should be taken to secure obedience to the law) was rejected by 221 votes to 89.

The report of the committee of the French Chamber on the Government Procedure Bill, with the accompanying documents was issued this morning. It described the measure as a piece of special legislation, essentially dictatorial and revolutionary in the worst sense of the word; condemned legislative intervention in judicial methods; criticised with severity the flimsiness of the charges brought against the Criminal Chamber and the character of the evidence adduced to support them; and declared that the committee had discovered nothing warranting suspicion of the honour and sincerity of any of the accused Judges. The report closed by denying that any advantage could result from the course proposed by the Bill, which would shatter the whole judicial organisation.

FRIDAY, February 10.—In the House of Lords, on the motion of Lord Dudley, the Companies Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee.

In the House of Commons Mr. E. J. C. Morton's amendment to the Address, regretting that the Queen's Speech made no mention of measures dealing with the ownership, tenure, or taxation of land in towns, was, amid loud and prolonged cheers from the Opposition, rejected only by 34 votes (157—123). The real subject of the debate and the division was the taxation of ground values. Noteworthy speeches were delivered by Mr. Fletcher Moulton, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Haldane.

President McKinley signed the treaty of peace with Spain and sent a Message to Congress advocating cable communication with the Philippines.

There was again serious fighting near Manila. The American troops, supported by a warship, made a combined attack on the Filipino position at Caloocan, and carried it by storm, inflicting heavy loss on the insurgents.

In the French Chamber M. Renault-Morlière presented the report of the Committee on the Government Bill for transferring revision cases to the whole Court of Cassation, and supported its condemnation of the Bill. The measure was defended by M. Dupuy, the Premier, and M. Lebret, Minister of Justice, chiefly on the ground that it was recommended by M. Mazeau, the first President of the Court of Cassation. It was strongly condemned by MM. Millerand and Pelletan. After a comparatively short and tame discussion the Bill was carried by 332 votes to 216.

SATURDAY, February 11.—Lord Russell of Killowen opened a new technical and art school at Kingston, and after dwelling on the importance of technical training, said he hoped the Legislature would be wise enough to frame laws to deal with company promoting, and the taking of illicit commissions. He trusted they would not hear of honest men being frightened to join boards of directors by reason of the stringency of an Act of Parliament; he did not believe that an honest man need fear the stringency of an Act of Parliament. Upon the subject of illicit commissions he was going to bring a Bill into Parliament this Session. He had been forced to do this by his knowledge, partly professional and partly judicial, of the canker of this system of secret commissions given to the prejudice of the honest and upright trader.

Lord Curzon, speaking at Calcutta in his capacity as Chancellor of the University, doubted the accuracy of the contention that the system of higher education in India was a failure. The ablest officials bore testimony to the upward trend in honesty, integrity, and capacity of Native officials in the Provincial services. Though defects existed, he maintained that the system was only faulty, not rotten; and he urged the need of a separate department of education, as in England.

A New York correspondent described the attitude of the majority of the American people towards the Philippine question as one of political fatalism. Their hands having been forced by events, they would, if necessary, conquer and annex the whole archipelago, accepting their new duties and destiny not gladly but sadly. Mr. Whitelaw Reid, one of the American Peace Commissioners, speaking at a dinner in New York, said that after Admiral Dewey's and General Merritt's victories, the United States were bound to take the Philippines. To leave the Filipinos to themselves would be a policy of scuttle, which no responsible Christian Power could adopt. The Filipinos were giving trouble, but nobody ever doubted that they would do so. It was the price which nations must pay for going to war, even in a just cause. If the Americans hesitated, the trouble would be great; if they acted promptly, with inexorable vigour and justice, it would be slight.

MONDAY, February 13.—In the House of Commons, Mr. Herbert Lewis's amendment to the Address, expressing regret that no reference was made in the Queen's Speech to questions specially affecting the interests of the people of Wales, was jected by 194 votes to 144.—Mr. Labouchere proposed an ment representing that it was expedient to any Bill passed by the House of Commons, but not submitted for the Royal assent in the Session in which it was passed, should, if passed again in the next Session, not go to the House of Lords but be submitted directly to the Sovereign for the Royal assent. Mr. Lawson Walton proposed to substitute the following amendment: "We humbly represent to her Majesty that the power at present possessed by the House of Lords to overrule the decisions of this House urgently demands the attention of Parliament." Mr. Walton's amendment was rejected by 257 votes to 107, and Mr. Labouchere's amendment was rejected by 223 to 105.

The Procedure Bill was introduced in the French Senate this afternoon, and referred in the usual course to the bureaux.—It was authoritatively denied that M. Manau, Procureur-Général to the Court of Cassation, was about to resign. M. Loew had transmitted to him the minutes of the revision enquiry, and if he reported in favour of revision the case would be sent for judgment before the Criminal Chamber if the Procedure Bill had not passed, but before the whole Court of Cassation if the Bill became law.—A Paris correspondent said that the news from London as to the conversations between M. Paul Cambon and Lord Salisbury was producing a very good effect there; an agreement on the Bahr-el-Ghazal question was believed to be certain, and an amicable solution of other difficulties was anticipated.

TUESDAY, February 14.—In the House of Lords Lord Stanley of Alderley questioned Lord Onslow with reference to outrages committed by European soldiers upon natives in India.

In the House of Commons the debate on the Address was continued.—Mr. Weir's amendment regarding the Crofters was negatived by 197 votes to 142.—Mr. Herbert Roberts's amendment regarding the Calcutta Municipal Bill was discussed and withdrawn (a full report will be found elsewhere). —Mr. Swift MacNeill's amendment declaring that the position of a public company director was incompatible with the position of a Minister of the Crown, and that the union of such offices was calculated to lower the dignity of public life, was under discussion when the House rose.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, in a letter to a French friend, published by the *Figaro*, says all his efforts will tend to the preservation of the best relations between the two Governments, and he firmly believes that all differences will be settled to the satisfaction of both countries.

WEDNESDAY, February 15.—In the House of Commons Mr. Swift MacNeill's amendment was negatived by a majority of 104 votes (247—143).

It was reported that the death at Middelburg, from plague, of an Indian who had left Bombay five weeks before had excited considerable alarm in the Transvaal, and at a meeting held in Pretoria on Tuesday night resolutions were passed supporting any action the Government might take to exclude Asiatics from the Republic during the prevalence of the plague in foreign parts.

Lord Justice Chitty died, after a very short illness, at his residence in London. The Lord Justice, who was born in 1828, was appointed a Judge of the Chancery Division in 1881, and was created a Lord Justice of Appeal in 1897.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, February 9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS BEYOND THE FRONTIER.

With reference to the question reported in our issue of last week, the following supplementary question was asked:—

Sir W. WEDDERBURN begged to point out that he did not refer to troops employed on the frontier, but to troops beyond the frontier.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The hon. baronet is merely playing with words, because we deny that there are any troops beyond the Indian frontier. ("Oh, oh!")

Monday, February 13.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table a copy of any further correspondence which had passed between the Government of India, the India Office, and the home military authorities on the subject of the retardation of promotion in the Indian Staff Corps.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have no objection to lay upon the Table of the House the further correspondence regarding promotions in the Staff Corps, if my hon. friend will move for it.

IMMIGRATION OF INDIAN COOLIES INTO REUNION.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether the proposed convention with France as to the immigration of Indian coolies into Réunion had been ratified; and, if so, whether he would lay a copy of it upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. Hamilton: The matter is still under the consideration of the French Government.

BOUNTY-FED SUGAR IN INDIA.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the imports into India of bounty-fed sugar were seriously affecting the refining industry and reducing the cultivation of the sugar plant, and consequently the revenues of the Government of India:

Whether he expected to be able to lay upon the Table at an early date the results of the enquiries now being carried on by the Indian Government as to the extent and effects of the competition of bounty-fed sugar in India:

And what steps the Government of India proposed to take to prevent the destruction of the industry.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have been for some time past in communication with the Government of India upon the subject of the question of my hon. friend, but our correspondence has not yet arrived at a point which enables me to publish it.

THE WAR BEYOND THE FRONTIER. TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF OFFICERS.

General Russell asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government had come to any decision regarding the repayment of their travelling expenses to officers who were on leave at home on the recent outbreak of hostilities on the North-West frontier of India, and who were obliged to rejoin their regiments and to take part in the campaign.

Lord G. Hamilton: It has been decided to maintain the rule under which passages are granted only to those officers who are recalled from leave by the Government of India or the Commander-in-Chief in India.

As regards officers who rejoined their regiments from leave during the recent campaign in India, the Commander-in-Chief has been asked to represent any specific case which he deems deserving of special consideration.

Tuesday, February 14.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

OUTRAGES BY EUROPEAN SOLDIERS UPON INDIANS.

Lord Stanley of Alderley asked her Majesty's Government whether the Indian Government had taken or intended to take measures to prevent the outrages committed by European soldiers upon the natives of India, such as had recently occurred at Barrackpur and Poonamallee. In putting his question, the noble lord said that events of this character were worse than any caused by the writing of ten or even twenty seditious articles. He quoted several cases of these unprovoked attacks on Natives by armed European soldiers, instancing one where a soldier—after having been successful on appeal—returned to his regiment, and was ultimately hanged for shooting a sergeant and a fellow-soldier. The noble lord went on to contend that only good conduct men should be allowed out with dangerous weapons, for besides coming into conflict with the Natives, it was no uncommon thing for British soldiers to shoot animals, the private property of the inhabitants. Another suggestion which he made by way of remedy was that all these charges of outrages by soldiers should be tried by court-martial, with open doors, instead of by juries, whose race feelings might prompt them to shield the accused.

The Earl of Onslow, in reply, said cases such as the noble lord referred to were not very numerous, only two having occurred in recent years, and one which happened eight or ten years ago. The Government of India had been consulted in this matter, and they were of opinion that there was no ground for taking any special measures as regards British troops in India. Cases of the nature alluded to were of very rare occurrence, and the ordinary law provided for the punishment of the offender. In the case of the outrages at Barrackpur the jury unanimously found the prisoners guilty, and they were sentenced to seven years' imprisonment. In the Poonamallee case a sentence of seven years' rigorous imprisonment was passed upon the soldier who was found guilty.

Lord Stanley of Alderley remarked that he considered the answer of the noble lord to be very unsatisfactory.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MEMORIAL FROM RANGOON.

Mr. Lowles asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had examined the memorial of the Municipal Commissioners of Rangoon, presented to His Excellency the Viceroy of India on November 14 last, and what steps had been taken to give effect to the prayer of the memorialists.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have seen no memorial such as is described in the hon. member's question. I have seen an account of a deputation from the Rangoon Municipality to the Viceroy in December last on the subject of the Rangoon town lands and the income therefrom. The Viceroy assured the deputation that their representations would receive full consideration from the Government of India. I have not yet heard how far it has been found possible to meet the views of the deputation.

INOCULATION IN INDIA. IS THE "CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR" RECOGNISED?

Mr. Bartley asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in dealing with the suppression of the plague in India, the conscientious objector who on conscientious or religious grounds objected to the action of the sanitary authorities in attempting to stamp out the disease was allowed to be exempted in the same way as the conscientious objector to vaccination was in this country.

Lord G. Hamilton: In dealing with the plague in India all possible respect is shown to the religious or conscientious scruples of the Natives. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that inoculation [torn] is not compulsory, though very large and [torn] Natives have availed and are availing them-[torn]

[torn] nderstand from the noble lord that the conscienti[torn] t recognised in India. (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. Hamilton: I did not say so. My reply must be gathered from within the four corners of my answer.

INDIAN AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

PRAYER FOR POSTPONEMENT AND ENQUIRY.

LORD G. HAMILTON PROMISES "IMPARTIAL CONSIDERATION."

THE AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN.

Mr. Herbert Roberts moved, as an amendment to the Address, to add at the end the following words:—"And we humbly assure your Majesty that we regard with grave concern the introduction of the Calcutta Municipal Bill, now under consideration by the Bengal Legislative Council, which, if enacted, will practically destroy the representative character of the Calcutta municipality, and will constitute a retrograde step in the system of local government in India, and pray that your Majesty will graciously direct that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed until a duly constituted Commission has taken evidence, and has reported upon the objections urged against the Bill by the ratepayers of Calcutta." He said that in moving this Amendment he disclaimed any desire to make it a party question. Self-government, in so far as it had progressed in India, was the work and the result of the policy of both political parties in this country. Municipal government in Calcutta, in its elective form, was introduced by Sir Richard Temple, in 1876, when the Conservative party were in power. Subsequently a similar system of self-government, based upon the elective principle, was extended to other towns and districts in India by Lord Ripon, between 1880 and 1884, during a Liberal administration at home. Later still, when the India Councils Act, which to some extent increased the popular element in provincial administration, was passed, it was the present Viceroy, then Under-Secretary for India in the Conservative Government of 1886, who had charge of the measure in the House of Commons. It was thus clear that the rights and privileges at present enjoyed by India had been conferred by both parties, and he took it that both parties were equally concerned in maintaining or promoting that policy of self-government in India, so far as it was consistent with good and efficient administration. (Hear, hear.) The Calcutta Municipal Bill now before the Bengal Legislative Council was calculated to destroy in that city the system of effective representative government which had been enjoyed by its citizens for the last twenty-two years. It therefore raised a question of grave importance from the standpoint both of India and of this country. Calcutta was the metropolis of India; along with Bombay it was the most advanced and progressive town in India; and, along with Bombay also it was the most populous city next to London in the British Empire. If self-government were fostered at Calcutta the people of India could reasonably hope that similar privileges would be gradually extended to other towns; but if municipal government in the metropolis of the country were virtually destroyed, it was not difficult to see that the liberal policy which had hitherto been pursued in India would receive a serious check. There was a clear distinction between the avowed object of this Bill and its real effect. So far as the Bill contemplated the sanitary improvement of Calcutta, it had his cordial support. They were undoubtedly responsible for the protection of the people of India, not only against foreign foes, but also against calamities such as famine and plague. It should be also borne in mind that Calcutta had a cosmopolitan importance, as one of the great trading cities of the world. All nations frequented its port, and they were bound to take all practicable steps not only to secure the healthiness of the town itself, but also to prevent the dissemination of disease through the medium of its trade to other countries. But he would lay it down as an axiom in such a problem as this, that it was impossible in a city like Calcutta with 860,000 population to secure satisfactory sanitary conditions without the loyal assistance and co-operation of the people themselves. His main contention therefore in stating the case for his amendment was that the history of the municipal administration of Calcutta proved that permanent improvement in the sanitary condition of the town was only possible and had only been achieved through the co-operation of those who formed the great mass of its population. The first Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal was appointed in 1854, and two years afterwards an Act was passed by which three Commissioners were appointed by the Government and made responsible for the municipal administration of Calcutta. This system of autocratic government failed completely to effect any improvement in the condition of the town. Mr. (afterwards Sir John) Strachey thus described the town in 1863:—"With regard to the northern or native division of Calcutta which contains some hundred thousand people, it is no figure of speech but the simple truth to say that no language can adequately describe its abominations." In 1863 the Government placed the municipal administration of the city in the hands of the Justices of Peace of Calcutta and of the districts of Behar, Orissa, and Bengal, resident at Calcutta. These officials did one piece of good work in the introduction of water works, but they failed effectively to cleanse the town or to improve its condition from a sanitary standpoint. After 13 years of administration they left the town practically as they found it, and he had before him the testimony of Dr. Payne, the health officer of the town at that time, who said: "It is impossible to conceive a more perfect combination of all the evils of crowded city

life in primitive filthiness and disorder than is presented in the native portion of Calcutta." The Record of Administration of Bengal, 1872-73, also condemned this system of municipal government in unmistakeable terms. In 1876, therefore, an elective system of municipal rule was introduced, as a remedy, by that distinguished Indian statesman, Sir Richard Temple. (Hear, hear.) The constitution drawn up and passed by him established a Corporation of 72 members, 48 being elected by the ratepayers, and 24 being nominated by the Local Government. The Chairman was elected by the Government but was removable by resolution of the Commissioners passed by a two-thirds majority. This constitution worked well on the whole and produced good results. In 1884 a Commission was appointed to enquire into certain matters connected with the sanitation of the town. Two of the Commissioners drew up a Report pointing out certain defects, which were afterwards remedied, but they did not recommend any constitutional change by way of diminishing the elective element in the Corporation. On the contrary they recommended that the suburbs should be added to the municipal area, and this was carried out a little later. The third member of that Commission, Mr. Cotton, now Chief Commissioner of Assam, did not sign the Report, and in his note of dissent bore remarkable testimony to the character and the work of the elected Commissioners who had been responsible for the condition of the city since 1876. He referred to them as follows: "The Corporation of Calcutta as a representative body commands the confidence of the vast majority of the ratepayers; it has already done very much in the direction of sanitary reform; it has not retrograded in giving effect to a single sanitary improvement; stimulated by the healthy action of public opinion and profiting by the greater experience gained year by year, it has afforded by the systematic enterprise of the past three years the most solid guarantee that it will continue to advance on the path of progress." (Cheers.) The main provisions of the new constitution passed in 1888 (the system now in force) were that the Corporation should consist of 75 members, 50 being elected by the ratepayers of the city and its suburbs, and 25 being nominated by the Government and the trade bodies of the city; there was also constituted an executive of 18 members, 12 being elected by the 50 representative Commissioners and 6 by the nominated members appointed by the Government and the trade interests of the town. The House would bear in mind two essential conditions of this constitution, both of which were reversed by the new Bill, namely that there was an exact relation between the representative and non-representative element both in the main body of Commissioners and in the executive, and further that the executive was responsible to the Corporation which elected it. It must now be enquired whether the system of municipal administration had worked so badly as to deserve to be destroyed, as it practically would be if the present Bill were passed. He submitted that the evidence proved abundantly that the contrary was the case. He would not appeal to witnesses who would be considered prejudiced, but would confine himself to the testimony of distinguished Indian officials, speaking as Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal. Take first the view expressed in 1890 by Sir Steuart Bayley, then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, when speaking of the period 1881-1890 in Calcutta municipal rule. "The successful administration of the affairs of the municipality during this long period, the firm financial credit of the Commissioners, the innumerable sanitary reforms effected, the increase in the material prosperity of the city which in consequence of these reforms has shown itself in so marked a degree, that the value of land in Calcutta may be said to have doubled." Take again the views expressed by Sir Antony MacDonnell in 1893 when he was Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. He referred to "the execution (by the Corporation) of much useful work especially in the direction of sanitation and structural improvements. The Commissioners themselves had as a whole displayed a care and attention to their duties which was very meritorious and had in some cases risen to the level of devotion." Lastly, he would refer to the opinion of the present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir John Woodburn, expressed only last November in respect to the Corporation of Calcutta: "They are entitled to all credit, and it is a high one, of realising the value of the great schemes which have been drawn up for their approval. They have not shrunk from the heavy taxation which was needed to bring these beneficent projects into effect, and I have myself had evidence of the high public spirit and laborious circumspection which many members of the Corporatien bring to the discharge of their municipal duties." Such was the character given a few months ago to the Calcutta Municipality by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. What then was their position? They did not claim upon these facts that the sanitary condition of Calcutta was ideal. Far from it. The work of the Commissioners had not been faultless and there were many improvements still required. What they did contend was that during the last 22 years, upon the evidence adduced, real progress had been made, and that the city of Calcutta to-day was in a far healthier condition than it was previous to the introduction of the elective principle into its municipal government; and further that improvements in future could only be effected by pursuing the same policy and by maintaining virtually the same constitution as now existed. (Cheers.) Upon the present Bill two principal questions arose, first, the nature of its provisions, and second, the reasons for its introduction. The number of Commissioners remained the same as before, but the executive was to consist of 12 instead of 18 members, 8 of whom were to be nominated by Government and by the trade bodies of the city, and 4 by the 50 elected representatives. In other words, of the 12, two-thirds were nominated by Government and business bodies, one-third by the representatives of the ratepayers of the city. The chairman was to be appointed by the Government; there was to be no vice-chairman, but a deputy-chairman, with engineering qualifications, might be appointed by the Government. The entire executive power might be vested, subject to certain restrictions, in the chairman. As to appointments of officials, the Commissioners might appoint a comptroller of accounts or a secretary, but all important positions, such as city engineer, officer of health, collector, and assessor, in fact all appointments commanding salaries above 300 rupees a year, were to be in the hands of the executive. Two further serious innovations were introduced, namely, that the members of the executive, meeting once a week, were to be paid 32 rupees per meeting, and half that sum for each committee, and also (and this provision was of vital consequence) the proceedings of the executive were not to require the approval of the Corporation. Such a system of municipal government stood condemned under any circumstances. The executive would be supreme, and it was so constituted as to give the Government nominees (for the Government and trades associations, as at present constituted, are identical in views) a standing majority over the representative members of two to one. If the Government had lost all faith in the capacity of the citizens of Calcutta to administer the affairs of their city, let them say so frankly and establish a system of government of one man control pure and simple. It was adding insult to injury to attempt to disguise the real destruction of self-government by the mere name and semblance of representative government. Such were the proposals of the Government of India in regard to the future municipal rule of Calcutta. The reasons given for these drastic changes could be classed under two heads, first, those which originally influenced the Government to undertake legislation, and those put forward when the Bill was framed. What were the original reasons given for the Bill? It was said that it was necessary to alter the present system in order to enable the Commissioners to recover a license tax from certain companies which now escaped its payment, and also to supply an omission in the present constitution with the view of enabling the Commissioners to exercise adequate control over the building operations of the city. To accomplish these two needful, but by no means gigantic reforms, a Bill was proposed containing 11 parts, 42 chapters, 668 sections, and 20 schedules, which in fact completely revolutionised the municipal government of the city. How was this to be accounted for? Here came in the second instalment of reasons given by the Government of India for the Bill. He would quote the words of the official statement of reasons attached to the new Bill: "Since the amendment of the law upon these points (the matters above referred to) was decided on, facts were brought to light in connexion with the alarm of plague in Calcutta which showed that the town was in a terribly insanitary condition, and that the present constitution of the municipality is ill-adapted to stand the strain of a grave and sudden emergency." Again, it had been said "the Bill would be of advantage because it would increase the share in administration of those great interests which had been over-borne by single interests of the ratepayers." It would be seen that the new Bill was based upon three main propositions: (1) That the city of Calcutta was in a terribly insanitary condition; (2) that the municipality had proved itself ill-adapted to meet the strain of a grave and sudden emergency; and (3) that the interests of the great trade bodies had been sacrificed to what are called the single interests of the ratepayers. Upon the reply to these propositions, therefore, the Government case must stand or fall. The first proposition was that Calcutta was in a terribly insanitary condition. The reply to that charge was contained in the views expressed by the successive Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal whose words he had quoted, and which amply bore out the fact that there had been a steady improvement in the condition of the town under the present municipal rule. Further, as a matter of fact, people were continually flocking into Calcutta as a health resort. The death-rate of the city compared favourably with that of many Indian cities, whilst the avoidance of plague on any serious scale spoke well for the sanitary condition of the city. With regard to the second charge, namely, that the municipality has shown itself ill-adapted to meet the strain of sudden emergencies, he would point out that past experience showed that it was when such emergencies arose that the assistance of the people was essential. With their aid much could be done; without it preventive measures could not be effectively enforced. But should it be considered necessary to reserve absolute power to the Government upon any sudden emergency, what was to prevent this being done by a single clause and without the accompaniment of a Bill destroying for all time the representative character of the municipality? It was said, lastly, that the great interests of the city had been overborne by the single interests of the ratepayers. The obvious reply to this complaint was that these great interests, so-called, had already the right to vote as individual ratepayers and as trading associations, and that any lack of weight they might have in the administration of the city was due to the fact that they were mostly business men and could not give their constant attendance at the meetings of the corporation. He submitted, therefore, that no case had been made out for the complete revolution proposed in the present system of government at Calcutta. There was no doubt as to the strength of the feeling aroused in Calcutta against the measure. (Hear, hear.) Meeting after meeting at which thousands had attended and which had been representative of all classes in Calcutta had been held to protest against the Bill. Under these circumstances, looking at the steady improvement which had taken place in the condition of the city since the elective principle was introduced, and the desire manifested by the municipality on all occasions to co-operate with the Government in any emergency, and having regard to the feelings of alarm and disappointment aroused by the Bill, he would press upon the Government that it was undesirable to proceed further with it until a public enquiry had been held by a duly constituted Commission, as in 1884, to consider the objections urged against the Bill by the ratepayers of Calcutta. He would ask the Government to pause before they passed this Bill, for if it were carried, it would mean that real improvement in the condition of the town would be impossible in future: that the services of many loyal and experienced men would be permanently lost to the town—a consideration of grave import in the event of any sudden outbreak of plague; and it would also be construed as a complete departure from our settled policy of fostering self-government in India in municipal matters, which on the whole had been followed during the last quarter of a century with the most beneficial results. For these reasons he begged to move the amendment which stood in his name. (Cheers).

Mr. ROBINSON SOUTTAR said that he rose to second the amendment of his hon. friend because he chanced to have some personal knowledge of the subject in hand. His late brother was one of the first chairmen of the Municipality of Calcutta, and during his residence in that city he (the speaker) had many opportunities of becoming acquainted with the Commissioners and of seeing the working of the municipality. (Hear, hear.) He could not speak too highly of the class of men who were Municipal Commissioners at that time. He still remembered with high esteem such men as the Right Hon. Kristo das Pal, editor of the *Hindu Patriot*, and Dr. Rajendrala Mittra, whose name was known to learned societies throughout Europe. These men had passed away, but others of equal merit had doubtless taken their place. The Calcutta Commissioners, as he knew them at any rate, were well educated, high spirited, excellent men; men fit to sit in the council chamber of any city in England—men, many of whom would be useful and welcome members of this honourable House itself. (Hear, hear.) He trusted that nothing would ever be done by the Government which would have the effect of making Natives of this class think it no longer worth their while to seek the suffrages of the people. The fear which he had in his mind that this might be the effect of the Bill now under discussion formed one of the reasons why he should like some parts of it to be reconsidered. As regards the condition of Calcutta itself, to remedy which this Bill was being passed, he thought a somewhat exaggerated impression had got abroad. Calcutta was a very fine city. The European quarter was magnificent, and had earned for Calcutta the name of the City of Palaces. Of course Europeans grumble at the state of their quarter of the town and always would grumble. It was partly climate and partly liver. (Laughter.) But when he told them that the death-rate in the Park Street ward, the chief European ward, was only eleven per thousand, they would agree with him that there was not a great deal to grumble about. The weak point of Calcutta lay, of course, in the Native quarter. Concerning even this, let him say two things, not by way of excuse, but in order that they might thoroughly understand the subject:—Firstly, Calcutta was not appreciably worse than other Eastern cities. Secondly, Calcutta was much better than it used to be. (Hear, hear.) The noble lord's attention had been drawn to remarks made by Sir John Strachey and others about Calcutta before self-government was started. They did not form pleasant reading. There was a time when Calcutta had no water supply, when the drains were open, and when scavenging was left to the kites and the crows. There was now an excellent water supply, a main drainage system, and a conservancy department which did much useful work. Without pushing the argument unduly, he thought the Commissioners were also entitled to point to the fact that though the plague which devastated Bombay reached their city it did not obtain a lodgment there. At the same time there was abundant room for improvement in Calcutta. The streets were badly swept, badly scraped, and badly scavenged. There was a great deal of congestion in the Native quarter; the houses there were often wretchedly built, and sanitary arrangements were of the rudest kind. One of the worst features in Calcutta was its tanks. The poorer Native houses were often built very simply, somewhat as baskets were constructed, with upright stakes, interwoven with long strips of bamboo. This was filled up with the commonest bricks, and plastered with mud, which hardened in the sun. When, in former days, a square was built, the mud required for the surrounding houses was taken from the middle of the square, and the hole so formed became a tank. As all Calcutta was built upon a sandbank, the tanks were full of water, and just as the inhabitants of a London square enjoyed the common garden, so the natives of Calcutta rejoiced in the common tank. There were hundreds of these tanks, of all sizes, covering in some places one-fourth of the area of the district, and they were freely used by the people, who bathed in them, washed their cooking utensils in them, and often enough drank from them. The continued existence of these tanks in their present form was most dangerous, but they must not think that they could be done away with in a day. Plenty of water was an essential of Oriental life, and the Calcutta Commissioners dared not sweep away the existing tanks until better were provided. This however must be done, and he supposed was being done, though perhaps rather slowly. He was convinced that the existence of these tanks, and the rank vegetation by which they were surrounded, had more to do with the death-rate in Calcutta than anything else. The death-rate in Calcutta was of course higher than it ought to be. Some parts were worse than others, and curiously enough the worst places were not in the city proper, but in the suburbs, for which the Calcutta Commissioners had not long been responsible. The worst place in the Calcutta district was the suburb of Entally with a death-rate of 48 per thousand. There were parts of Calcutta where the death-rate was reasonable. Park Street had a death-rate of 11 per thousand, and Fenwick Bazaar, where nearly thirty thousand people dwelt, had a death-rate of 23, which would be considered satisfactory in an English city. The death-rate of the city proper with its population of half-a-million, was 32 per thousand, but when they added the suburbs, bringing the population up to three-quarters of a million, the death-rate rose to 36. It must seem strange to the European mind that the suburbs should be more unhealthy than the city, but it was purely a case of tanks, jungle, and want of sanitation. Now it was in order to put this right that the Government were promoting the Calcutta Municipal Bill, and so far, he certainly had no quarrel with the noble lord. He thought Calcutta was capable of much improvement and that it ought to be improved. For his part he did not suspect the noble lord of any desire to strangle local self-government in India. He did not see why he should. Self-government in India was not an innovation of the wicked Radicals. (Laughter.) The Calcutta Corporation Bill was, if he remembered rightly, the work of Sir Richard Temple, and was introduced at a time when Lord Beaconsfield was Prime Minister. The Conservative party might in a sense claim local self-government in India as their offspring, and why should they wish to strangle it? (Hear, hear.) Moreover he had no doubt that the Bill under discussion was in many points a good Bill; the only quarrel he had was with its constitutional clauses, in connexion with which, he added, a great mistake was being made. (Hear, hear.) His hon. friend had dealt largely with these clauses, and he was not going into details, but for the sake of clearness he would remind them that whilst at present there were seventy-five Commissioners who worked through a general purposes committee which was two-thirds elective, and which submitted all its actions to their approval, the Bill proposed that there should be seventy-five Commissioners, and a committee of twelve, of whom one-third only would be elective, and who would not submit their actions to the approval of the general body. Now he was willing to admit that the existing arrangement was bad, but he thought the alteration proposed in the Bill would make confusion worse confounded. The trouble in Calcutta arose to-day largely from over centralisation, and the Government proposed to centralise still farther. At present there were seventy-five Commissioners, but the bulk of the work was done by eighteen men. Well, two things happened. First, the work was badly done. If every man of the seventy-five was giving his heart to the work they would all have enough to do, and how could eighteen men do it? Second, the work which was done was rendered abortive by criticism. This stood to reason. What happened here when a burning question which ought to be discussed in Committee of the whole House was sent upstairs to be settled by a few men? Why, when it came down again, every member who was interested, every man who thought he ought to have been on that small committee, made a speech and cut up the work. In the Calcutta Corporation there were at present eighteen busy men and fifty-seven critics. By the present proposal there would be twelve busy men and sixty-three critics. (Laughter.) Of course they knew that this would never work, and therefore they proposed that the committee should not have to submit its work to the Corporation at all. In other words the Corporation would in future consist of twelve active men and sixty-three dummies. (Laughter and cheers.) Well, it won't work. He believed the proposed alteration to be based on an entire misconception of the difficulty. It was not greater concentration that was needed in Calcutta; it was greater division of labour. (Hear, hear.) The General Purposes Committee as it at present worked was a mistake. Instead of giving the burden to either twelve men, or eighteen men, each Commissioner should receive his task. The city itself should be divided into districts, and there should be not one, but perhaps a dozen committees, each man serving on the committee for which he was best qualified, and, generally speaking, no man serving on more than two committees. The committees should elect their own chairmen, and these together might form the finance committee, over which, as well as over the general meetings of the Commissioners, the chairman of the municipality should preside. Everything done at the committees must of course come before the general body of the Commissioners for approval, for without that there could be no self-government, but as every member would have had a hand in the work, and would be anxious to push his own business through, he would not obstruct the business of the rest. He was convinced that the secret of improvement in Calcutta municipal affairs lay in this direction. If they wanted the Commissioners to talk less and work more they must give every man his work to do. (Hear, hear.) He believed he did not mistake his men when he said that on the lines proposed there would be a rivalry between the committees to see which could do its work best and most quickly. (Cheers.) There was another reason why he believed the method proposed, of trying to do the work of Calcutta by the agency of twelve men, and without the cordial support of the other Commissioners, would prove a failure. Most of the Government nominees would probably be Europeans. Were this not intended there would be no need to alter the proportion, for the Natives could always be trusted to elect their best men to the General Purposes Committee, such as they were. Well, were they sure that Europeans, presumably commercial men, would be the best men for their work? Europeans of the commercial class were greatly engrossed in business, they had a very superficial knowledge of the language, they knew little of the Native quarter of the city, and their knowledge of the Indian was based largely upon their experience of their domestic servants. On a finance committee they would be useful, no doubt, but not being as a rule men with any special knowledge of sanitary affairs, either at home or abroad, on a general purposes committee they would, he thought, not be found of much use. The result would be that the chairman would have to do all the work and the committee would say "Aye" to whatever he suggested. He had no doubt that the chairman would be an excellent man, but no man, however able, should have so much responsibility placed upon him. (Hear, hear.) Apart from these considerations there were special reasons why municipal government in India must be worked through Native Commissioners whether the House liked it or not. He was speaking to men many of whom had been in India, and knew something of the strange caste prejudices of the people, "prejudices" in our eyes, but to them more important than life itself. These baffled the reformer at every turn; they baffled the sanitary reformer most of all. They were not peculiar to the rich, but were shared with equal intensity by the poor. He remembered once passing a few of his own workmen preparing their evening meal. The sun was setting and his shadow fell upon their cooking utensils. In a moment the men rose up; though he was their employer their meal was defiled by his shadow, the food was thrown away, the very cooking utensils were broken in pieces. How could Europeans by themselves grapple with a society permeated by ideas such as these? (Hear, hear.) Behind their seventy-five Commissioners, mostly enlightened men, there were seven hundred thousand Natives, who were not enlightened but bound fast by prejudice and superstition. In our fine, go-ahead, Anglo-Saxon way, we drove business through and gave this or that order, and before we knew, there was murmuring, and riot, and it might be rebellion. It might be all very absurd, but—it was India. They might work to some extent without Natives in such exalted assemblies as the Imperial Council, and Bengal Legislative Council, but in municipalities they must work largely through friendly and enlightened Natives, because municipal matters touched the daily life of the people at every point.

(Hear, hear.) This was especially true in Calcutta, because in that city caste prejudice runs high. In Bombay the population was of a different sort. There was a great mixture of races, there were thousands of Parsees, Jews, and Armenians, who were without caste prejudice, so that life was of a much freer sort. It was not so in Bengal. Perhaps it was a pity. If we had to re-create the Bengali we might create him differently. But we must take him as he was, and let us remember that with all his faults, he was an intellectual force in the East, and that Calcutta was a great centre of thought and national life. But now let him say in conclusion, that if the Indian Government wanted local self-government to thrive, whether in Calcutta or anywhere else, they must take a much more important step than they had yet taken. The Calcutta municipality was not the only one in India that needed stirring up. Had it ever occurred to the noble lord that the Government had themselves to blame for this state of things? He did not mean the present Government in particular, but all the Governments since local self-government was started in India. Let them turn their minds for one moment to their own country. Sixty years ago, local self-government was started in this country. Was it a success at first? Not at all. Doubtless it was an improvement on the previous corruption, but our local administrators did not learn their business at once by any means. Well, what did the Government do? Did they abolish municipal self-government? Did they turn the councillors into lay figures, and govern the big cities by committees of twelve? Certainly not. They treated them as a good schoolmaster treats dull pupils. They gave them a clever tutor in the shape of the Local Government Board to help them, and under its watchful care our municipal system had become what it is. (Hear, hear.) One would have thought that with English experience to guide, the Indian Government would have established a Local Government Board in India simultaneously with the establishment of local self-government. But this was not done. Whether the Government thought that the Natives were more clever than our local administrators at home, and could pick up sanitary knowledge by instinct, he did not know, but they were thrown into the water and left to sink or swim. Well, a good many of them looked like sinking. The noble lord knew well that Calcutta was not the only place that demanded attention. Special attention had been drawn to it because so many Europeans lived there, but there were various municipalities requiring attention just as much. The difficulties the Government were facing in Calcutta were difficulties they must face in many places, and it was better to realise this, and meet them on a uniform plan. Was the plan they were applying in Calcutta about to be applied generally? If so, then the Government were deviating from the line of policy which their predecessors had held in view for half a century, the policy, namely, of slowly but steadily teaching the natives of India to govern themselves. He did not think it could be the desire of the Government to do this, yet this was the legitimate outcome of their action, for if Calcutta, the most cultured city in India, was not fit for self-government, no other city was. (Hear, hear.) "Sir," said Mr. Souttar in conclusion, "if municipal government in India is to be successful you must establish a powerful Local Government Board, having at its disposal the best sanitary knowledge India can command, both medical and engineering; a Board which will keep in touch with every municipality, jealously scrutinise the death statistics, and have full power to inspect, advise, warn, arbitrate, and compel. (Cheers.) Such a board would not interfere with the development of local self-government, but would help it immensely. It would greatly relieve the Lieutenant-Governors of the provinces, and be a tower of strength to every health officer, engineer, and chairman. A board of this sort ought to have been established long ago, but it is not too late yet. (Hear, hear.) In my hon. friend's amendment a Commission is called for. Personally I do not think that a Commission to enquire into Calcutta alone would be worth much. The facts about Calcutta are pretty well known, and at any rate easily ascertainable. But if a Commission could be appointed to enquire into the condition of local self-government all over India, with the view of strengthening it, that might do great service. Meanwhile I trust that the noble lord will encourage us to hope that the constitutional clauses, at all events, of the Bill will be seriously reconsidered, in order that it may be seen whether there is not a better way." (Cheers.)

On the return of the Speaker after the usual interval,

Mr. R. McKenna said he made no claim to special knowledge of Indian affairs, but he regarded this as one of those cases in which it became the duty of every private member of the House to exercise his duty of safeguarding the interests of the inhabitants of India. The proposal of the Bengal Legislative Council amounted to the practical repeal of the power of local self-government in Calcutta. If it were carried into effect he believed it would leave an impression on the educated opinion of India that they were going back on the policy they had publicly advocated and supported for the last 25 years, and that they no longer believed in the possibility of educating the people of India in the principles of self-government. That would, in his opinion, be disastrous, and he would appeal for such a consideration of this Calcutta Municipal Bill and for such a delay as was suggested in the amendment as would give an opportunity of at least satisfying public opinion in this country, if they could not satisfy it in India, that there was a case for the abolition of local self-governing institutions in Calcutta. Failing a case being proved, this Bill should not be allowed to pass.

Mr. George Harwood recognised that there must be a good deal to be said on another side, otherwise the Indian officials would not have proposed such a change, but he would ask the Government to look at the question from a broad point of view. When the people outside realised the facts of our Indian Empire, which far transcended any poetry or any romance, one would surely expect that that House would be alive to the poetic charm of the situation. But that was not the experience of the members. When they remembered what was said in justification of the British Empire and then watched the way in which the House of Commons accepted the responsibilities and duties of that Empire, they were almost driven to the conclusion that much of these claims were mere fustian and had no solid, intelligent basis. The House of Commons might be divided into three elements on Indian questions—first, those who took a particular interest in these questions, and who laboured under the disadvantage of seeming always to take the Native view; second, the official element, which confined itself to giving expert opinion and often *ad captandum* answers to questions; and third, the great mass of members, who, judging from the empty state of the House on such occasions, took no interest in Indian questions. (Hear, hear, and "Oh!") Was that a wise and right attitude? He fully and gladly admitted that the Indian Civil servants were an admirable body of men—indeed British Civil servants were throughout the Empire, otherwise it would not last a week. (Hear, hear.) But it did not always follow that the men on the spot were the best qualified to decide upon the principles according to which the Government should be regulated. (Hear, hear.) Their perspective was liable to be distorted by their close contiguity to the problems they had to solve. Then, again, the irritability produced by the climate had to be considered, and further, the Anglo-Saxon, when brought into contact with Natives, was apt to have certain feelings which disqualified him from taking an impartial view of a situation. Therefore the House of Commons was just the body which could take a just perspective, and should be careful not to act blindfold on the advice of the most able Civil servants. Again, a great wave of Imperialism had swept over this country. He did not say he regretted it, but they ought certainly to utilise the occasion to ask themselves as a nation and as a House whether they realised that Empire had its corollaries and its duties. It seemed to be taken for granted by the House that if other nations who were plundering like ourselves agreed with us then everything was settled.

The Speaker thought the hon. member was getting rather wide of the question.

Mr. Harwood said his argument was to show that the final duty and result of empire should be to train the people in the countries we took over to appreciate that fundamental element of Western civilisation which they called self-government. We could not go on extending our Empire unless that duty was discharged, for we had not the force, the people, or the intellect to continue to govern all these territories with the same minuteness of personal government we had shown. Municipal government seemed an uninteresting subject but underneath it lay a still greater question—viz., were we or were we not to extend self-government among the 250,000,000 of the Indian people? (Hear, hear.) If we were, great care must be taken to do nothing which would be a discouragement of that principle. (Opposition cheers.) If the Bill to which the amendment referred were carried, it would be a discouragement to the hopes of self-government throughout the whole Empire of India. (Hear, hear.) He believed that the Indian people were animated by a sense of gratitude and of loyalty, but they also had a great hope that they would be trained in self-government, and learn some of the discipline which had brought out of the rough material of the Anglo-Saxon the complicated but fairly complete government we now possessed. He trusted that the Secretary for India would be guided by these considerations, and would not be governed merely by the question of Calcutta municipal government. (Opposition cheers.)

Mr. C. E. Schwann thoroughly endorsed his hon. friend's general principle, and thought that they ought to do all that lay in their power to further self-government amongst the Indian people. All who had visited India within the last few years had noticed that recently there had been a decided tendency on the part of the Indian Government to put back the hands of the clock. (Hear, hear.) Only a few years ago it was attempted in Bengal to abolish the right of trial by jury, but that project was dropped. He feared, however, that the Bill they were discussing arose from this retrograde feeling. When he was in India the officials thought an Englishman should be the president of every municipality and local body, but that idea was most repugnant to the Indian people, among whom were many intelligent business people quite able to take such a position. No doubt municipalities in India were at times unseemly and unruly, but they had in England seen cases which did not throw any credit or dignity upon corresponding institutions. (Hear, hear.) In both countries such cases were exceptional. The reports of the English Commissioners upon Indian municipalities published a few years ago were almost without exception of a favourable nature. As to Calcutta, he should like to ask whether the Indian Government, which directed the municipal affairs of that city before the present municipal government, always acted up to the highest European mark. It would be acknowledged it did not. He himself visited schools in Calcutta which had just been taken over from the Government by the municipality and found them wretched institutions, sometimes being wretched, badly lighted rooms over stables. Some share of the blame for the present condition of Calcutta must be taken by the Government which preceded the Municipal Council. He thought that Mr. Souttar's suggestion that a Local Government Board should be established in India which would foster and guide municipal institutions was admirable, and hoped it would receive the consideration of the Government. He urged the Government to lay aside any narrow official view of the question and to look at the wider interests of the people. He thought that delay should take place in order that Lord Curzon, the new Viceroy, who had already shown a considerable amount of acumen and was not likely to be led by the nose by officials, might consider this matter.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Bill will have to go before him.

Mr. C. E. Schwann said he was very glad to know that, and thought that the debate would help Lord Curzon to arrive at a satisfactory decision on the Bill. (Hear, hear.)

Sir H. Fowler said the House had so few opportunities of expressing its opinions on Indian affairs that it was not out of place that upon a question of this gravity it should express, he would not say a definite or a final opinion, but a strong opinion as to the aspect that should be assumed. The municipal government in Calcutta dated back to 1876, and the present measure was founded upon

a measure introduced by Sir Richard Temple in that year. The Bill was reconstructed in a great many points in 1888, and what they were dealing with was the municipality of Calcutta as it was constituted in 1888. It was now in 1899 proposed to materially alter the municipal government in Calcutta. He thought the first question they had to ask was what had been the past history of the experiment? Had it broken down in any one of its conditions so flagrantly, so utterly, and apparently so hopelessly that it was absolutely necessary in so short a period of ten years to pull the thing to pieces and alter it again in a manner which would be very foreign to our own dealing with municipal government here, and which they had reason to think was very unpopular in India? As he understood the matter, the Council of Calcutta consisted of 75 members. Fifty of those members were elected, as members were elected here, by popular voting—the vote of the ratepayers. Fifteen of them were nominated by the local government, and the other ten were elected by various bodies, such as the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, the Calcutta trade associations, and the Commissioners for the port of Calcutta. Though the nominated element was rather strong, he thought that on the whole there was a fair distribution of the elective principle. But there was an executive committee, or a cabinet which as he understood really did do the work. Sir Richard Temple and the other wise administrators who formed the original municipality followed in the constitution of the executive precisely the principle adopted in respect to the Council. The executive committee or cabinet consisted of 18 members. Twelve of these were elected by the 50 elected members of the municipal corporation, and the other six were elected in various proportions by the non-elected and the Government nomination. The whole question now under discussion turned upon the constitution of the second body. As he understood the new proposal, it was suggested to leave the original constitution of the 75 members as it is, but to reduce the executive committee from 18 to 12, and instead of giving the elected members power to elect two-thirds it was proposed to allow them to elect one-third only. In Sir Richard Temple's legislation the work was unpaid, but the Bill now proposed to be introduced gave for the first time fees. We were trying a great experiment in India and one which had been successfully tried—the introduction as far as possible of self-government in the large municipalities. Of course they made blunders and did stupid things. He should like to know what municipal corporation or county council in England had not done stupid and foolish things; had not retarded sanitation; and had not required legislative compulsion to make them do their duty, and now and then the heel of the Local Government Board to be put upon them to keep them up to the mark. (Hear, hear.) Education in municipal work was a slow process. Perhaps they talked too much and too long. Too much talk was not confined to municipal life. (Hear, hear.) He was not sure that the Mother of Parliaments was free from that objection. (Hear, hear.) But with the Englishman who understood the working of Parliamentary and municipal life and local self-government in all its ramifications those objections would not weigh in the least against the general principle of enlisting the people in their own self-government. (Hear, hear.) The process of education must be carried on in Calcutta and Bombay, and he thought the checks—if they were to be called checks—which the local government of Bengal introduced under the sanction of one of the wisest Lieutenant-Governors Bengal ever had—their old friend Sir Richard Temple—were sufficient for the purpose. (Hear, hear.) He himself did not see any evidence to justify the statement that the system had broken down and that they should introduce into an experiment not ten years old the novel principle of substituting nominated officials for popular elected bodies, and throwing to the winds an efficient popular government. With regard to the suggestions that had been made, they could sufficiently safeguard the satisfactory working of the sanitary work of that department of the Government without imperilling what was a vital principle as far as self-government in India was concerned. Now he would draw attention to the unwisdom of exciting public feeling on a question of this sort. No doubt considerable public feeling had been roused in Calcutta on the question and had been exaggerated But exaggeration of the kind was not confined to the East. He had himself received documents in language which was not very wise with reference to the step taken, and improper motives were imputed to the Government in connexion with it. But looking at the delicate relations between this country and India, looking at the Oriental mind and the rapidity with which feelings of this sort spread and assumed dangerous proportions, it was not wise to put the Imperial Central Government of India and the Government of Bengal in conflict unless there was absolute necessity. They might have gone too far ten years ago, but it would be unwise to go back. Let it be proved that there had been public danger to the peace, good government, or health of Calcutta, and he would be the last to shrink from supporting the Government of Bengal in such an emergency. In England we had educated our people to local self-government, and there had been a marvellous change in the capacity for local self-government here and a marvellous public expenditure with wonderfully good results on the same lines. Let us encourage local self-government in India as long as we incurred no risk. (Hear, hear.) He did not know what view the noble lord the Secretary for India would take. They could not expect him to say what he would do, because the matter was not before him judicially. But the final decision on the Bill still rested in his hands. But what he wanted to submit to him was that it would be desirable that the Bengal Government should not send this Bill home in its present state even to him, and unless they could make out a much stronger case, they should be willing to wait until the experiment had had a fairer trial, until the new Viceroy (of whom a great many of them had the highest opinion) had an opportunity of considering the matter. At all events, it should be kept in reserve until the House on a future day and in a clearer light had a better opportunity of pronouncing a sound judgment upon it. (Cheers.)

Lord G. Hamilton said that as every one who had listened to the debate must admit, all who had spoken had done so in a tone of grea moderation. There had been a desire on the part of every speaker to eliminate as far as possible all points of controversy, and all had endeavoured to put forward suggestions which they believed would be to the benefit of India generally. His task in replying was, too, all the easier because the debate had been free from those reflections on the Civil Service which had, unfortunately, too often characterised debates on India. If hon. gentlemen would only recollect that it was the duty of the Secretary for India to defend in that House those who were discharging the most difficult and onerous duties of any public servants in the world, and discharging them well, they would refrain from observations which forced the official head of the service to take notice of them and perhaps adopt a different attitude from what he otherwise would have done. The supporters of the motion assumed that they were promoting the best interests of the people of India. But never had a motion been made that struck deeper at the root of self-government in India. For many years past every British Government had endeavoured to promote local self-government in India by the creation of local legislatures. These local legislatures had, within certain limits, freedom of action. He had himself while he had been in office added to the number of existing local legislatures. Of all those legislatures the most important was that of Bengal. But the hon. gentleman proposed, in the interests of local self-government, to summarily arrest the whole of the proposed legislation of Bengal, to stop the investigation now being carried on by a special committee, and to institute a Commission whose business was not to take an impartial view of the questions under consideration, but whose duty was to be confined to reporting on the objections which could be urged. He appealed to any one who had any wish to promote local self-government in India, could any motion be more destructive of it?

Mr. Harwood: What is the composition of the Legislature of Bengal?

Lord G. Hamilton: It is composed, as all local legislatures are, with the idea of representing as accurately as possible the constituent elements of the populations in which they live.

Mr. Harwood: How much is elective?

Lord G. Hamilton asked what was the use of the hon. gentleman putting questions of that kind. (Cheers.) Did he know what the population of India or the elective population of Calcutta was? These local legislatures had to go through certain preliminaries before they could introduce any Bills. They had to get the assent of the Viceroy and the Secretary of State in Council. He was in a position of some difficulty, because in a few months he would have to decide whether the Bill in the shape it emerged from Committee should pass into law or not; and, therefore, in his speech he would make use of facts and arguments to traverse the statement sufficiently to show that there were two sides to this question. It must be agreed that the municipal government granted by a higher power to a local authority must be withdrawn by that higher power if the local authority misuses or neglects the functions delegated to it. At the same time, every higher authority, when there was a municipal body representative in its character, was far more tolerant towards the proceedings of that body than if it was directly under its control. In India, as in this country, there had always been shown towards a municipal body into which a representative character entered, considerable leniency towards its shortcomings. But there was a line beyond which such leniency was no longer possible, and that line was reached when the inaction of the municipality endangered the lives of the community under its charge. Every speaker from the other side of the House had assumed that out of sheer wantonness of spirit and from a desire to destroy or retard the representative principle in India this Bill has been introduced, and it was assumed that the Bengal Government was so short of work that it had gone out of its way to find this task. He recalled the minds of members from the regions of imagination into which they had wandered to the conditions to be faced by the Government in India. In the first place, plague was prevalent in certain parts of India, and at any moment might descend on Madras and Calcutta, and if it once became epidemic in Calcutta, it was impossible to calculate the injury and the harm that would follow, not only to Calcutta, but to the whole of the north of India. The injury done in a few years in Bombay by the plague could not be appraised, not only in actual local mortality, but by the terror causing a periodical exodus of inhabitants, carrying with them the germs of disease into various portions of the Presidency. Bombay was a seaport for the greater portion of the export and import trade of the west of India, and out of this trade arose occupation for tens of millions of people. With that trade paralysed the means of subsistence of these millions would be gone. The sanitary regulations of a seaport town in India was a matter of international interest. The sanitary condition of Calcutta during the last few years had unquestionably deteriorated, and in ten years the death-rate had increased 30 per cent. In earlier days, no doubt, the work of the municipality was well done; but in recent years it was the almost universal opinion there had been a steady deterioration, both in the character of those who served on the municipality and in the work done. He did not wish unduly to press this point, and as a short and conclusive way of proving to the House the accuracy of his statement, he quoted from a report in the Blue-book on the sanitary condition of Calcutta. Fortunately there had only been a few sporadic cases of plague in Calcutta—(hear, hear)—but when the first case of bubonic plague occurred there the lieutenant-governor appointed a commission to investigate the sanitary condition of the town. The commission was composed of eight gentlemen of experience, and in addition one of the most able medical officers, of exceptional sanitary experience, was lent to the corporation to discharge the functions of medical officer. In the report made by this officer in 1896 he described the state of the worst wards as being filthy beyond description, and he stated that his services for twenty years would not be more than sufficient time to bring the chaotic condition of affairs into anything like order. This was entirely endorsed by other reports of the commission. The Government of Bengal had to deal with the knowledge that the sanitary condition of Calcutta was appallingly bad, and then arose the question to what this was due. He wished to

preserve a judicial temperament on this and all questions relating to the Bill, but he was bound to say evidence showed that this condition was largely due to the chaotic system of administration which prevailed in Calcutta during the last few years. A third of the Corporation was composed of barristers, and for the last nine years a complaints committee had been established. It would be obvious to anyone accustomed to local self-government what the result would be likely to be on the lower grade of officials in the discharge of their duties. Hon. gentlemen had quoted one or two extracts from the speeches of ex-Lieutenant-Governors in support of the theory that Calcutta was very well administered and that the sanitary conditions were satisfactory. The hon. gentleman who moved the motion, however, had not seen the significance of the extract he read. It was no compliment to the municipality of Calcutta, it was a compliment to the chairman, and if the hon. gentleman would read the concluding part of his own extract he would see that the enumeration of benefits was stated to be a sufficient and lasting tribute to the manner in which its first chairman had discharged the duties of his responsible, difficult, and thankless task. It was well known to everybody who had lived in Calcutta of recent years that the only thing that made the municipal corporation, since it had been established, an efficient body was the extraordinary tact and ability which its first chairman had displayed. The attempt to carry on under almost impossible conditions the executive work had been too much for almost all the able men who had subsequently succeeded him. Those were the conditions which were brought before them; they had a most deplorable sanitary condition in Calcutta, and they had, moreover, a body of gentlemen, no doubt actuated by the highest possible motives, who had, he believed, the reputation of being the most talkative local authority in the world. He did not say that that in itself was a reason why they should be disestablished—(ironical Opposition cheers)—but when they had got to deal with the plague at Calcutta—the most awful calamity by which the human race could be afflicted—they could not allow talk to stand before work. (Hear, hear.) It was essential that the Indian Government should protect the lives of the people under their charge, and should take care, so far as they possibly could, that Calcutta did not run an undue risk from ineffective administration and from thoroughly defective sanitary arrangements. It was for these reasons that the Bill was introduced which was now under the consideration of the Bengal Council. Since that Bill had been introduced there had been a change in *personnel*, both as regarded the official who was Viceroy of India and the official who was Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The hon. gentleman the mover of the motion had quoted with approbation the language which Sir J. Woodburn used in connexion with this very Bill only three months ago. If Sir J. Woodburn was three months ago capable of taking a fair and equitable position on what he admitted was a difficult question, why did the hon. gentleman imagine that in the three months that had since elapsed he was now incapable of maintaining that attitude? Lord Curzon had an absolutely unbiassed mind on this question, the sanction to introduce the Bill was given before he arrived in India, and he thought the House had the utmost guarantee that under a system of government conducted as the Indian system was this Bill would from those high in authority receive absolutely impartial and fair consideration. It was perfectly clear to anybody who had looked through the proceedings in past years connected with the Calcutta municipality that if an effective administration was in future to be set up it should not be a miniature model of the existing municipality. That was present, he believed, to the mind of Sir Alexander Mackenzie when he made the proposals which were before the Bengal Legislature. In Bombay the Executive Council consisted of 12 members, four of whom were nominated, and eight elected. The composition of the council proposed in this Bill was that there should be four members nominated by the Government, four nominated by the great trades of Calcutta, and four nominated by the electors of Calcutta. There was a great difference between the composition of the population of Bombay and that of Calcutta. In Bombay there was a diversity of race and of religion, there was a large Parsee element and a large Mahometan element, and the Native members consequently were much more disposed to take an independent view of the questions that came forward. In Bengal the natives were all much of the same race, and the class of members who were returned, so he was informed, were of much the same social standing and had much the same interests to support. One of the objects of Sir Alexander Mackenzie in wishing to have the nomination of four Government members was to include a Mahometan to represent Mahometan interests, which at present it was admitted on all hands were not adequately represented in Calcutta, and also to put in some one who would look after the interests of the poor Hindus of Calcutta, whose welfare at present, in the opinion of the Bengal Government, was not sufficiently safeguarded. There was no idea, therefore, of nominating members so as to select no one but Europeans; on the contrary, the object was to give a more adequate representation to the native races and classes, who, under a limited franchise, did not receive sufficient representation upon the Calcutta municipality. He agreed that they ought to try to preserve as far as they possibly could the representative element on the municipality, but the establishment of an efficient executive was of paramount importance. He had stated the views and objects of which the Bengal Government had in introducing this Bill, and shown that it had been introduced in accordance with the system of local self-government which had been promoted by every Governor and every party during the past forty years. He hoped, therefore, the House would accept his assurance that he would, to the best of his judgment, impartially consider the many provisions of this Bill when it came finally before him. It was a serious matter, affecting the health and lives of those who were under the control of this local legislature, and the primary object of this legislation was to fight against the plague. (Hear, hear.)

Sir William Wedderburn said he was sorry the noble lord had not seen his way to accept the moderate and reasonable proposal of his hon. friend, and to give the ratepayers of Calcutta a fair hearing before destroying their self-government. (Hear, hear.) He quite agreed with the noble lord that the bubonic plague was a terrible thing and that all efforts should be made to keep it out of Calcutta, but as a matter of fact the existing municipality had made such efforts and had been successful in keeping the plague out of Calcutta. Why then should they be punished for doing good and successful work? The noble lord had quoted the report of a health officer that certain parts of Calcutta were in a filthy state. Could not health officers report the same sort of thing as regards London and every large town in the kingdom, but would that be considered sufficient ground for upsetting municipal government? It was evident that the noble lord had not mastered the history of Calcutta sanitation. He had not realised the fact that there had been failure when the management was under Government officials, and success under the representatives of the ratepayers. This was proved by the testimony of the officials themselves, and of the various Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal quoted by his hon. friends. If a great constitutional change was now to be made, a great revolutionary change, he would ask where was the great body of evidence, and where was the mature enquiry which proved the necessity of such a change? (Hear, hear.) So far as he could judge the evidence was practically all the other way. The witnesses upon whom the noble lord appeared to rely were Sir Alexander Mackenzie and Sir John Woodburn, but he (Sir W. Wedderburn) thought he could show that these witnesses who were called to curse, had blessed the municipality.

Lord G. Hamilton: This is Sir Alexander Mackenzie's Bill.

Sir W. Wedderburn: Yes; and I would therefore invite the special attention of the noble lord to the remarkable speech of Sir A. Mackenzie in December, 1896, at the opening of the great drainage works at Entally in the Calcutta suburbs; and I do so for two reasons: First, because this was the occasion on which Sir Alexander sprung upon the municipality the unexpected and startling news of their condemnation; and secondly, because the case of the suburbs is valuable for comparison between official and municipal management. Up to the year 1884 the suburbs were outside of the municipality and under official management; and this was the description given by the Sanitary Commission of 1884 of their condition: "The insanitary condition of the suburbs which surround Calcutta on the north, east and south, is admitted; there is no underground drainage, no pure water supply, and the conservancy arrangements fall far short of those in force in the town." Accordingly the Sanitary Commission recommended that the management of the suburbs should be handed over to the municipality. This was done, and the result was seen in the great drainage works at Entally, the opening of which Sir A. Mackenzie was inaugurating. Sir Alexander congratulated the municipality on these works which he described as gigantic, difficult, and costly. He said that a wise caution had been displayed regarding them, and that the delay in their completion had not been inordinate; and he added that, though it had its shortcomings the municipality had never "shown niggardliness or been backward in sanctioning money for either water supply or drainage." Further he declared that the town was "quite remarkably healthy." Having thus acknowledged the public-spirited activity of the municipality and the practical success of its work, was it not an extraordinary occasion to choose for announcing that its constitution was to be upset? And what were the grounds given? The first was that members of the municipality talked too much. This was a failing which the hon. House would look on with indulgence. Next, the executive was not strong enough. But this was a familiar bureaucratic complaint. Officials never liked to be controlled by the representatives of the taxpayers. Lastly, too great deference was shown to special interests. This charge could better be brought against the promoters of the Bill who sought to give preponderating power to the wealthy European class. The special interest favoured by the municipality was that of the ratepayers, and very properly so. Now could there be charges more vague and insufficient to justify a constitutional revolution? (Hear, hear.) And in proposing his revolution Sir A. Mackenzie showed a misconception of the facts. For he stated that the constitution of the Calcutta municipality had been borrowed *en bloc* from the most advanced models in England, and he quoted the case of Birmingham. But in Calcutta the Government nominated a goodly proportion of the Commissioners, and appointed the chairman of the Corporation. He was sorry that the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies was not present, as he could no doubt have assured them that in Birmingham the Government neither nominates Town Councillors nor appoints the Mayor. (Laughter.) But perhaps the most curious part of Sir A. Mackenzie's speech was when he confessed that his constitutional changes were unnecessary, as the existing law was sufficient: "I believe," he said, "as a matter of fact, you could do nearly all that is wanted for the future under your existing law" . . . . "with most of the evils depicted by the Sanitary Commissioners your existing Act gives ample power to deal." This was the witness brought forward by the noble lord in support of his revolutionary change. What more could be said against it? The other witness, Sir John Woodburn, speaking last November in the Legislative Council, showed a similar confusion of ideas. He asserted "that the Bill did not in any way infringe the principle of self-government." But under the existing law the representatives of the ratepayers were in a majority of two to one in the Executive. Under the Bill they were to be reduced to a minority of one to two. How could it be said that this did not infringe the principle of self-government? The municipality was being transformed from a popular to an official administration. He was glad to see that Sir J. Woodburn acknowledged the importance of the great public meetings held in Calcutta to protest against the Bill. Six such meetings had been held from December 21 to February 7, the last having been convened by Sir Romesh Mitter, late Acting Chief Justice of Bengal, the chairman being the Hon. Mr. Ghose, member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council. Sir John Woodburn also admitted the merits of the Municipal Commissioners. He complained that their zeal was excessive. But he did not say that their zeal outran their discretion. On the contrary he said, "They have

shown so much good sense and public spirit in all the graver matters of the past, that I have entire confidence in their bearing for the future." Could anything more favourable be said of any public body? He further took occasion to thank them for the great help they had rendered in the plague, by calming the fears of the people and in establishing temporary hospitals for the sufferers. He (Sir W. Wedderburn) had no wish to screen any shortcoming or obstruct any reforms. But he maintained that the changes proposed were in the wrong direction, as proved by past history, and he protested against revolutionary changes except after careful and impartial enquiry. He would suggest the following points for enquiry: (1) What was the sanitary condition of Calcutta now, as compared with what it was before self-government? (2) Should the progress have been greater, looking to the funds available? And (3) if so, has the progress been impeded by defects in the Constitution? (Cheers.)

Mr. Herbert Roberts said he thought the course of the debate did not justify him in pressing the amendment to a division, and he therefore asked leave to withdraw it in the hope that the clauses of the Bill would be modified to meet the views of himself and those who had supported him.

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

THE POONA ASSASSINATIONS.

MORE NONSENSE ABOUT "CONSPIRACY."

JINGOES IN A HURRY.

As we briefly announced in our last issue, a Bombay telegram, dated February 9, reported that the informer Dravid and his brother, who were to have given evidence against Balkrishna Chapekar in connexion with the assassination of Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand in July, 1897, were shot on the previous night.

The brothers Dravid afterwards died.

On February 10 the Secretary of State for India received a telegram from the Governor of Bombay as follows: "District superintendent of police, Poona, reports Vasudeo Chapekar, youngest brother of same family, attempted to shoot police officer yesterday, and when arrested admitted murder of Ganesh Shankar (Dravid). Another armed confederate has since been arrested."

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* hastened to telegraph on February 9: "The Poona shooting case is regarded as proving that the conspiracy which brought about the original murders still exists."

Here, it will be seen, are two pure assumptions: (1) that the original murders were due to conspiracy; and (2) that the conspiracy still exists.

Yet Mr. W. H. Crowe, the judge who tried the elder Chapekar (who was hanged last April for the murders), stated in public durbar at Poona that he had carefully watched the trial for any evidence of a conspiracy, and had found no such evidence.

Some of our Jingoes in London bettered the example of the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times*, as will be seen from the amazing editorial article in the *Standard* which we reproduce below.

THE "STANDARD."

Our telegrams from Bombay this morning show that Poona, the Brahmin metropolis of Western India, has been the scene of another act of assassination which can only be attributed to a political motive and bears all the marks of deliberate premeditation. The brothers Dravid, members of the caste, had given evidence against the man charged with the murder of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst; and it was mainly on the strength of their testimony that the prisoner Damodhar Chapekar was convicted and executed. They had in fact played the part of informers. On Wednesday night they were under some pretext induced to leave their home and, having reached one of the principal streets of the city, were attacked by a gang of men who fired several shots at them. Both the victims have since died of their wounds. No arrests were made, and apparently the criminals escaped even pursuit. There is at any rate no immediate clue to their identity. It is only natural that an occurrence of the kind should cause dangerous excitement in the Native population, and serious concern to the European community—not in Poona alone. For the moment sedition has wreaked a terrible revenge on those who assisted the law. The mystery in which the affair is still shrouded increases the horror, and the popular imagination will be struck by the audacity of the design and the methodical coolness with which it was carried out. Yet, disquieting as the incident undoubtedly is, in so far as it illustrates the existence of an organised and desperate faction, it would be a mistake to assume that any really formidable and far-reaching conspiracy is on foot. The story of Carey and his little ring of "Invincibles" in Dublin shows how easy it is for the most despicable band of scoundrels to create a brief reign of terror. Just as public justice defeated in the end the plots of the assassination circles of fenianism, so the struggle with the Murder League of Poona Brahminism can have but one end. It is possible to carry still further the parallel between Irish-American outrage and the Deccan atrocities. In each case an official of the British Government was brutally murdered by way of retaliation for acts done in the conscientious discharge of his duty, while with him was killed "by mistake" another Englishman who had never given what the organisers of revenge are pleased to call provocation. Carey, who betrayed his confederates, fell a victim to the resentment of their supporters, and now those who brought Damodhar Chapekar to the scaffold have paid the penalty with their lives. It is not unhappily the only symptom of the existing activity of disaffection. There have been numerous attempts, some serious, to cause injury to those who have taken any part in vindicating the law. The immediate object of the latest outrage was to prevent the informers from renewing their evidence against Damodhar's brother, Balkrishna Chapekar, who was lately apprehended in the territory of the Nizam; and also of course to intimidate other persons who might be called by the Crown to depose against him. The police will be at no loss as to the general direction in which they are to prosecute enquiries. The wretches who perpetrated the crime are presumably the tools of powerful men who fancy they are astute enough to evade justice. While we recognise fully the gravity of the fact—long familiar to Anglo-Indians—that there exists in the great Mahratta city a number of men who, for one reason or another are normally disaffected to British rule, and whose antipathy has been stimulated by anger at the enforcement of sanitary regulations for staying the plague, they must not be taken as types of their fellow townsmen or of the Brahmin community throughout India. No class is more heartily attached to the British *régime* than the members of the higher castes. It is only in Poona that memories of the honours and emoluments they enjoyed as "Pillars of the State" under the Peshwa dispose certain great Brahmin families to sedition. Unhappily, their selfish traditional enmity has found conscious or unconscious allies in a very different stratum, the men to whom our educational zeal has given a veneer of Western culture, and who fancy they play the patriot when they traduce the Government. The somewhat drastic measures which it was deemed expedient to take to stamp out the plague gave an impetus and opportunity to disaffection by affronting some of the dearest Native prejudices. Strange as it may appear to an enlightened Englishman, it is a sober fact that many an excellent and loyal Hindu who speaks the English of Addison and thinks on the lines of Herbert Spencer, would prefer to see wife and sisters die of pestilence rather than have them saved by compliance with regulations that no English lady would think even disagreeable. For them the honour of their women is everything, and honour implies seclusion. In spite of our good intentions, we have not always succeeded in reconciling the prophylactics of State hygiene with tenderness for the scruples of Native society. (*February* 10.)

THE "DAILY NEWS."

The informers who brought the murderers of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst at Poona to justice have themselves been assassinated. They were two brothers of the Brahmin caste named Dravid. They were lured out of their house at Poona on Wednesday night and shot down by a gang. Neither left any clue to the identity of the assailants. A policeman who was engaged in the same case has been attacked. The case for detection does not look promising as it stands, but we must wait for the end. The former case was equally unpromising at first, yet, in time, the Government was able to hang the murderer and, as it usually happens with scoundrels of this sort, on the evidence of his own people. He shot Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand from behind as they were returning from a reception of the Governor of Bombay in the year of the last Jubilee. Mr. Rand was the chief plague authority of Poona, and he had been constantly denounced by the Native Press for his energetic measures against the outbreak. The murderers of the informers probably acted more from a motive of private and personal vengeance. This, however, ought only to tend to narrow the area of search for the police. (*February* 10.)

THE "DAILY CHRONICLE."

The open assassination in the streets of Poona of the informers who had given information respecting the alleged murderers of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst, and this on the very eve of the trial of one of the accused, is a fact of the utmost seriousness. One of the original assassins was run down, tried, and executed almost at once; his brother contrived to secure his safety by flight, and was recently found in Hyderabad territory and taken to Poona for trial. The brothers Dravid were the principal witnesses against one as against the other, and their "removal" places the Bombay Government in a more serious difficulty than ever. For it shows not only that there was considerable sympathy with the assassins, but also that the sympathy has now become a conspiracy to defeat the ends of justice and to intimidate witnesses for the Sirkar, even Brahmins, who are so commonly regarded as sacro-sanct. (*February* 10.)

THE "MORNING LEADER."

The remarks which from first to last have been made upon the Poona assassinations afford a typical exhibition of the minds of our Jingoes. A year and a half ago, when Lieutenant Ayerst and Mr. Rand were murdered, our "Imperialists" of the cool brain and iron nerve at once inferred a political plot, and Lord George Hamilton published the inference as so much fact in the House of Commons. Shortly afterwards the self-confessed assassin, Damodhar Chapekar, an illiterate beggar, was arrested, convicted, and hanged. The theory of a plot instantaneously collapsed. Indeed his judge, Mr. Crowe, stated publicly at Poona that he had carefully watched the trial for any indication of a conspiracy and had found none. So far, so good. But a few weeks ago one of Chapekar's brothers was arrested on a charge of complicity and was to have stood his trial yesterday. On Wednesday, however, the two chief witnesses against him—who had also been witnesses against his brother—were shot. One would naturally have thought that after the earlier warning our Jingoes would hesitate to revive the theory of a conspiracy. Yet yesterday they fell to it again with undisguised relish—begging their questions, assuming their facts, and proving nothing as before. Take for

example the *Standard*, which was followed by the slighter organs of the party. It began with the perfectly gratuitous assertion that the assassination of Wednesday "can only be attributed to a political motive." A few sentences later it hazarded the remark that "for the moment sedition has wreaked a terrible revenge on those who assisted the law." From this the transition was easy to "the existence of an organised and desperate faction," and to chatter about "the struggle with the Murder League of Poona Brahminism," until we reach this astonishing climax: "The wretches who perpetrated the crime are presumably the tools of powerful men who fancy they are astute enough to evade justice. While we recognise fully the gravity of the fact—long familiar to Anglo-Indians—that there exists in the great Mahratta city a number of men who, for one reason or another, are normally disaffected to British rule," etc., etc. This imposing superstructure, built upon pure hypothesis, has once again been overthrown by the confession of the prisoner's younger brother, who committed the crime by way of personal revenge. Now, it is no doubt idle to argue with our Jingoes about the unfairness of inventing conspiracy, traducing innocent men for the crimes of ignorant fanatics, and finding a political motive for every personal offence. But will they not perceive at least the inexpediency of advertising so persistently their fear of imagined sedition; and will they not ask themselves, in the light of history, whether a fierce policy of repression is the best preventive of secret crimes of violence? (*February* 11.)

THE DEBATE ON THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

The debate last night upon Mr. Herbert Roberts's amendment to the Address, calling attention to the Calcutta Municipal Bill, was most opportune. If ever any proposal of the Indian Government called for protest in the House of Commons it is surely this Bill, which will virtually deprive the ratepayers of Calcutta of the rights of local self-government which they have exercised for twenty-two years. The Bill does not abolish the Municipal Committee, two-thirds of whose seventy-five members are elected by the ratepayers, but it reduces the Committee to impotence. At present the fifty elected Commissioners choose two-thirds of the members of the Executive Council, which actually carries out the work of administration. In future, if the Bill passes, the elected Commissioners will only choose one-third of the Executive. By this simple device the popular majority in the Committee will be rendered powerless to control its own local affairs. The excuse put forward by the Indian bureaucracy, and repeated by Lord George Hamilton, is that the Calcutta municipality has neglected the sanitation of the city. Plague is still threatening, and "when they had to deal with plague they could not allow talk to stand in the way of work." This of course is a serious argument, but it seems to be quite certain that the sanitary condition of Calcutta has greatly improved since the Municipal Committee was formed in 1876, while it is very doubtful indeed whether it requires a municipal revolution to carry out new drainage schemes. The truth appears to be that the reactionary element in the Indian Government has seized upon this question of drainage as a pretext for restricting the small measure of local self-government granted to the Indian people by a more tolerant generation of administrators. Lord George Hamilton's suggestion that for Parliament to interfere with these reactionary bureaucrats would be to violate the true principle of local self-government for India may seem ridiculous, but some of our Indian administrators really do seem to think that they are a law unto themselves, and that not even Parliament may criticise them.

THE "STANDARD."

Of the amendments moved last night the one which was least open to reasonable cavil was that which raised the question of the contemplated change in the constitution of the Calcutta Municipal Council. Although the Liberal members who spoke more or less in terms deprecating the suggested modification appear to us to exaggerate the significance of the measure, they discussed the subject with a reasonable moderation which is not always conspicuous in the English echo of Bengalee grievances. It is in truth hardly accurate to assume that there is any large body of Native opinion hostile to the modification of existing arrangements, as to which Mr. Roberts, Mr. Souttar, and Mr. Schwann hinted a certain uneasiness. Lord George Hamilton reduced the affair to its proper dimensions by a simple recital of the facts, and no impartial and well-informed critic will consider that there is the smallest incompatibility between the intentions of the India Office and the principle of caution and forbearance which was upheld in Sir Henry Fowler's statesmanlike and impressive speech. It may be explained at once that the Bill which has caused apprehension to English friends of municipal self-government for India is a project before the Bengal Legislative Council. That is a body which carries the representative theory quite as far as most Liberals who have given any attention to Indian matters would think for the present expedient. Nor has it been dictated by any ill-will to the establishment and maintenance of popular municipal control. Local self-government is no doubt on its trial; but the change proposed for Calcutta does not touch the representative element, and will serve rather to raise the credit than to diminish the power of the Corporation. It has been felt, and almost universally acknowledged by the Native community, that sanitary administration has not been what it ought to be. We might use much stronger language, but it suffices to recognise that the gravest danger to public health exists owing to the indifference or the inefficiency of the Native authorities of the City Council. The fault lies not in the general body (which will remain unchanged), but in the executive committee, and as to this the main innovation will be an addition to the nominated and a reduction of the elected element. The motive is manifest, and the necessity scarcely disputed. Sanitation is essentially a Western faith, and even the most cultivated Natives are often either sceptical as to the value of the regulations which English authorities treat as indispensable, or are apathetic in carrying them into effect. Pure water, efficient drainage, and wholesome dwellings are commonplace ideals with the ordinary British ratepayers; but use and wont in Calcutta blind those who are by origin in touch with popular feeling to the supreme utility of expenditure for securing such boons. Yet in no region of the world does neglect entail such awful penalties as in the vast metropolis which has been created by Western enterprise in the swamps of the Hooghly. Humanity is the one consideration which prompts the alteration. It is no pleasure but a very keen disappointment to Anglo-Indian administrators to find that in the very centre of Western culture a town council, constructed as far as possible on English models, has failed in one leading department of its duty. Further there is the amplest guarantee that representative control will not be impaired beyond the proved and crying needs of the situation. If the Bill passes in the Bengal Legislative Council it will not become law until it has been closely examined and approved, first by Lord Curzon—whose instincts are all in favour of autonomy—and next by the Secretary of State.

THE "DAILY NEWS."

No rule, however beneficent, can be considered entirely satisfactory unless it tends to create in the subject races such life and energy and initiative that an improvement in power of production may accompany the increase of numbers. This is the great problem before our Indian administrators. And this is why even such a question as is involved in the Calcutta Municipality Bill, which occupied the House of Commons yesterday, is supremely important to the general welfare of the empire.

THE "TIMES."

The greater part of what has been, and will be, debated on the amendments to the Address is either trite or trivial. Can any man of sense pretend that there is the smallest advantage to be gained in existing circumstances by debating-society arguments on such questions as the constitutional position of the House of Lords or the demand of the Irish Nationalists for Home Rule? Can anyone maintain that the position of the Scottish crofters and the changes proposed to be made in the municipal government of Calcutta by a measure now before the Bengal Legislative Council are topics of such paramount and urgent importance that a large part of the time of the House should be given up to talk over them which can end in nothing? It is to be remarked that the probable result of these discussions, in which only a small minority of the House on either side take part, will be to interfere with the more legitimate opportunities of private members later on.

THE "MORNING LEADER."

Our readers are already familiar with the main outlines of the Calcutta Municipal Bill which the Indian Parliamentary Committee brought before the House of Commons last night on an amendment to the Address. The Bill, which is nothing if not subtle, proposes to take away all real authority from the representatives of the Calcutta ratepayers and to transfer it to an official committee, which will be paid fees to induce it to attend meetings, and which will consist of two official members to every representative member. This is rightly described as a destruction of the representative character of the municipality, and we are glad to see that Sir Henry Fowler, who is singularly remiss as a rule upon Indian questions, joined last night in the protest of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The amendment asked for the postponement of the Bill pending full enquiry. Lord George Hamilton did not consent to this course, but he seems to have blended some non-committal remarks about impartially considering the Bill with a good deal of unmerited abuse of the Calcutta Corporation. This appears to have been thought sufficient to warrant withdrawal of the amendment. For our part, we should have liked to see a division taken.

THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE."

Lord George Hamilton very properly refused last night to give countenance to the appointment of a Commission to interfere with the Bengal Legislative Council's consideration of the Calcutta Municipal Bill. Sir Alexander Mackenzie, whom no one could charge with being unfriendly to municipal institutions in India, was himself the framer of the measure in

question, which, he declared shortly before his regrettable retirement, was imperatively required to put an end to the chaos that existed in the administration of the internal affairs of Calcutta. Anybody who followed with care and attention the proceedings of the local council of that city must have come to the same conclusion as the late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Hours that ought to have been occupied in practical discussion were wasted in windy talk, and those who wanted to be doing real and useful work were obstructed by the flatulent oratory of a coterie of notoriety seekers. Small wonder that the moment arrived when Government felt that the state of things could no longer be tolerated in the interests of the inhabitants of Calcutta. Local self-government in India, properly regulated and controlled, is to be encouraged, and we are confident that, when the Bengal Legislative Council has passed its Bill, Lord George Hamilton will see that its provisions are not unduly restrictive or retrograde.

THE "STAR."

The Indian Parliamentary Committee pleaded in vain in the House last night for at least a postponement of the Calcutta Municipality Bill. This Bill practically makes an end of local self-government in Calcutta and hands the affairs of the great city over to a paid official majority. The main reason for this drastic measure is the unreasonable loquacity of the old municipality, a weakness towards which the people at St. Stephen's at least might have been expected to show a little generous indulgence. As was pointed out in last night's debate, public bodies in England perpetrate blunders occasionally, and have to be pulled up by their superiors, and we have even heard of Cabinet Ministers, including Indian Secretaries, that have made a sorry mess of things. But they have not met with the same fate as the Calcutta municipality. Of course Lord George Hamilton refused to interfere with the objectionable Bill, and thus a severe blow is dealt at representative institutions in India.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On February 6 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee addressed a large meeting at Wibsey, Yorkshire, on "India and our Duty to It." The Rev. F. Pointer presided. There was a good discussion and many questions were put to the lecturer, who was cordially thanked for the lecture.

On February 7 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee delivered a lecture to the Bradford Women's Liberal Association at the Mechanics' Institute. The lecture, entitled "India and its People," was illustrated by lime-light views. Miss Gregory, M.B.S.B., presided over a fair attendance.

On February 9 a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee addressed a well-attended meeting at the East Bradford Liberal Club on "Can Russia invade India?" There was an excellent discussion in which many gentlemen took part. The "forward" policy was unanimously condemned.

Speaking on "Current Politics" at Cowling, near Keighley, on February 10, to a large audience, a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee dealt largely with Indian affairs, and referred to the way in which the present Government was curtailing the liberties of the Indian people.

A large gathering of four or five hundred people assembled at the Town Hall, Sowerby Bridge, to hear addresses given by the Right Hon. J. W. Mellor, Q.C., M.P., and Miss Alison Garland, a lecturer on behalf of the British Committee, on February 11. Miss Garland spoke of the grave problems that need to be solved if we are to have a more prosperous and contented Indian Empire, and begged her hearers to give more attention to the needs and wishes of our Indian fellow-subjects.

P. & O. COMPANY'S INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIAN MAIL SERVICES.

P. & O. FREQUENT SAILINGS TO GIBRALTAR, MARSEILLES, MALTA, EGYPT, ADEN, BOMBAY, KURRACHEE, CALCUTTA, CEYLON, STRAITS, CHINA, JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, TASMANIA, AND NEW ZEALAND.

P. & O. CHEAP RETURN TICKETS AND ROUND THE WORLD TOURS.
For particulars apply at the London Offices, 122, Leadenhall Street, E.C., or 25, Cockspur Street, S.W.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 *pp.*

Published by the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

"INDIA," 1898.

VOLS. IX. AND X.

READY SHORTLY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of Volumes V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897), can also be obtained. Price 8/6 each, post free. Remittances should accompany order.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,
SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S
PECTORAL BALSAM.
A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.
For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.
DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.
P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TOOTH-ACHE
CURED INSTANTLY BY
BUNTER'S Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.
Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.
NERVINE

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85 Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.